Marxism Today

Theoretical and Discussion Journal of the Communist Party
September, 1973 20 pence

Editorial Comments

LUIS CORVALAN

WE SAY NO TO CIVIL WAR! BUT STAND READY TO CRUSH SEDITION

MARTIN JACQUES

TRENDS IN YOUTH CULTURE: SOME ASPECTS

DAVE COOK & DIGBY JACKS
A Note on the International Socialists and the Student Movement

Discussion:

PETER PINK
Marxism and the Family

JOHN WRIGLEY & A. RAY
The Althusser Debate

JOHN HOFFMAN
Marxism and Dialectical Method

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MARXISM TODAY

THEORETICAL AND DISCUSSION JOURNAL OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

Volume 17, Number 9

Editor James Klugmann

Editorial Board Irene Brennan/Gabriel Carritt/Tony Chater/Jack Cohen/Maurice Cornforth/Maurice Dobb/John Foster/John Gollan/Arnold Kettle/John Mahon/Betty Matthews/Alan Morton/Bert Pearce/Michael Seifert/George Wake/Nick Wright

Editorial Correspondence James Klugmann, 16 King Street, WC2E 8HY

Advertisements Doris Allison, above address

Orders and Subscriptions Usual agents or Central Books Ltd., 37 Gray's Inn Road, London WC1X 8PS

Subscription rates £2.85 per annum

CONTENTS

	Editorial Comments	**257**
Luis Corvalan	**We say No to Civil War! But Stand Ready to Crush Sedition**	**262**
Martin Jacques	**Trends in Youth Culture: Some Aspects**	**268**
Dave Cook and Digby Jacks	**Note on the International Socialists and the Student Movement**	**282**
Discussion:		
Peter Pink	**Marxism and the Family**	**284**
John Wrigley and A. Ray	**The Althusser Debate**	**286**
John Hoffman	**Marxism and Dialectical Method**	**288**

SOME ARTICLES PLANNED FOR OCTOBER—DECEMBER ISSUES

Alan Bush	**Marxism and Music**
Richard Clark	**The "No Limit to Growth" Debate**
Jack Cohen	**On the Nature of the Working Class**
Hans Hess	**Is There a Marxist Theory of Art?**
John Hostettler	**Ultra-Right Trends in Britain**
Mick Jenkins	**Some Unemployed Struggles in the Thirties**
Bill Moore	**The Role of Parliament in British History**
Dave Priscott	**The Communist Party and the Labour Party**
Barrie Stacey	**The Marxist View of Human Nature**

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Editorial Comments

HARD on the heels of the militant resolutions being debated at this month's TUC come resolutions framed in a similar spirit for next month's 72nd Annual Labour Party Conference.

They reveal the enormous difference in outlook between the rank and file activists and the right-wing Labour leadership entrenched in both Parliamentary Labour Party and the Shadow Cabinet.

On all the outstanding issues facing the British people, prices, incomes policy, control of the giant monopolies through more extensive and effective nationalisation (on which there are no less than 72 resolutions and reference to it in many more), the Industrial Relations Act, Housing, Transport, Regional Development etc., etc., the resolutions express the desire for clear, militant, class policies.

Equally marked is the forthright rejection of Harold Wilson's claim to the right of "veto" by the Parliamentary Committee on any proposals it disagrees with. No single resolution supports this claim. Every one printed on this matter asserts the right of Conference to frame policies, demands that they should be binding on the Parliamentary Labour Party and on future Labour Governments and, to make the point crystal clear, many resolutions demand that the Conference, not the Parliamentary Party, elect the Leader.

Since these resolutions appeared the Liberals have made sensational victories at the by-elections at Ely and Ripon. These have been widely described as "marking the end of the two-party system" and the elevation of the Liberal Party to a position where it constitutes a potent electoral threat to the two major parties.

THE LIBERAL GAINS

The way to end any such Liberal "threat" is to make the resolutions before the Labour Party Conference the basis for Labour's immediate policy, to commence a united militant campaign immediately after Conference to explain their meaning and, of the greatest importance, to develop a mass united struggle (which includes the Communists) for their implementation. In this way the real forces can be mobilised which can force both the resignation of Heath and a General Election as well as the return of a Labour Government which will carry out a working class policy.

The Liberals have conned thousands of sincere, well-meaning people, sick of Tory policy and concensus politics and longing for a real change, into believing that they represent a real, progressive alternative both to Labour and to the Tories. They represent nothing of the kind. On all the major questions —Common Market entry, the major cause of the escalating price increases (especially in food), Prices and Incomes policies, Industrial Relations Act, Housing Finance Act etc., etc., their policies are identical with those of the Tories.

In a long, extraordinary fulsome leading article *The Times* (July 31), boosted the Liberals and proclaimed that "the Liberal movement has as much to contribute to national life as the Conservative movement or the Labour movement". The danger it saw was in a Labour Party "which had been captured by the Left".

Only the Labour movement fighting unitedly for the genuinely alternative policies embodied in the resolutions put before the TUC and the Labour Party Conference, can fulfil the aspirations of all those who have been mislead into supporting the Liberals.

What looks good to *The Times* cannot possibly be good for the mass of the British people.

THE TWO NATIONS

While the Tories seek to proclaim themselves as the champions and builders of "One Nation", their policies widen the gap between the "Two Nations" which everyone with eyes to see knows to be the basis of the real Britain today.

The real situation in class divided, inequality-ridden Britain is analysed in a most thorough and devastating fashion in the latest Labour Research Department pamphlet.[1] As is to be expected from the LRD the source of every fact in this well researched pamphlet

[1] *The Two Nations. Inequality in Britain Today*, Labour Research Department, 78 Blackfriars Road, London SE1 8HF. Price 15p.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is meticulously provided. These facts centre around a fundamental point made right at the beginning, namely that "... major inequalities stem, not from differences in ability, but from ownership of the means of production by a tiny minority of the population".

What this means in terms of inequality of the "Two Nations" is then presented in figures, tables, analysis. Only some can be quoted here:

> "The total value of the wealth of individuals in Great Britain in 1970 was estimated at about £97,000 millions . . . figures quoted by Professor Meade[2] show that 5 per cent of the adult population in England and Wales owned three-quarters of all the property in 1960 . . . the top 1 per cent of wealth holders in 1954 owned four-fifths of all personally held company shares and the top 5 per cent owned 96 per cent."

The pamphlet lists the wealth and incomes of the very rich and the merely rich. There are millionaires many times over, like a group at the head of which is Lord Thompson, the value of whose shareholdings is given at £59.5 million and at the bottom of which is a Mr. Kreitman with a mere £10 million worth of shares in Tesco's (Holdings). There are the 138 people earning £100,000 or more a year; the 3,114 who in 1969/70, received an income from investments of £20,000 or more a year; the 294 recorded in that same year as earning £20,000 or more. And, by contrast, "nearly one-sixth of adult male workers earned less than £17 a week in 1969 and 45 per cent less than £22. And in 1971 there were 4½ million people living on means-tested supplementary benefits."

How the very rich get round death duties by family trusts and the rich get round taxation by tax avoidance, how company directors are helped on their way by innumerable perks, such as chauffeur driven limousines, expense account meals, "business trips", "golden handshakes" and fat pensions on retirement, assistance with house purchases, with the education of their children etc., are all exposed; so is the way all this works out in terms of differences in pensions, compensation for redundancy and dismissal, unemployment and leisure possibilities, housing, health and education, between the "Two Nations".

All the Tory moonshine about "One Nation" is perhaps best summed up in the following "the *Daily Mail* on October 5, 1972 reported that a grand-luxe suite in the liner 'France' for a three months world cruise cost £43,000. At current rates it would take the average male industrial wage earner 23 years of continuous work to earn this much".

The facts given fully confirm two statements by academic economists which are quoted, one by Professor Atkinson[3] that "Britain has the doubtful distinction of leading the international inequality league", and the second by Webb and Sieve[4] to the effect that inequality of incomes at the end of 1950 was as great as it was in 1937. And the trend since 1950 has not changed.

COMMUNIST UNIVERSITY OF LONDON '73

The Communist University of London, initiated five years ago and held this year at the end of June, has been a great success.

This year 280 people registered, over 220 of them for the whole of the nine days of the University. With those who came only part of the time or for individual events, including the lecturers, well over 300 people must have participated. The majority of these were students but there was also a sprinkling of young, and not so young, workers who were spending part of their holidays at the University.

Not all present were communists by any means. The University attracted people of diverse political and theoretical views, which made for lively discussion and controversy.

The University was organised to cater for people at different levels and different needs. There was a nine session Introductory Course in Marxism. At a somewhat more advanced level there were four general courses open to all the students. These were on Marxist Philosophy, Marxist Economics, State and Class Struggle, and Imperialism. For those who wished to discuss the application of Marxism to particular disciplines at a quite advanced level, there were specialist courses in economics, education, philosophy, literature, sociology, science and technology, history, art and design.

There were also three plenary sessions during the course of the nine days addressed respectively by Professor E. J. Hobsbawm on "The Marxist Approach to Philosophy and History", James Klugmann on "The Marxist View of Man" and John Gollan on "The British Road to Socialism".

There were films, socials, lively discussions and debates on topical subjects during the evenings. The keenness of the students

[2] See his "Efficiency, Equality and Ownership of Property".

[3] *Unequal Shares. Wealth in Britain 1972.*

[4] *Income Redistribution and the Welfare State.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was evidenced by the splendid total of well over £440 worth of literature sold.

The final sessions in all the courses were devoted to elucidating the views, criticisms and suggestions of the students themselves about the University. These, along with the lessons learnt by the organisers, will provide the basis for ensuring that CUL6 1974, preparations for which will begin soon, will be even better than this most successful one.

JUDICIAL SYSTEM IN CUBA

Presiding over a ceremony to inaugurate the Council of the People's Supreme Court at Havana on July 2, Dr. Osvaldo Dorticos Torrado, President of the Republic of Cuba, made some important observations on the development of Cuban legal institutions.

The inauguration, he said, represented the first practical step in the development of a new Cuban judicial system. He thanked all those who had been working for several years towards this development under the leadership of Comrade Blas Roca.

In the first years that followed the Revolution, the President said, "counter revolutionary activity and the struggle against it were the matters which received top priority from the Revolutionary Government so far as the creation of jurisdictional organs went". But justice continued to be administered in those years. There were, of course, betrayals, but "our just recognition goes out to the comrade magistrates and judges who, in spite of the institutional limitations of the old legal system, continuously maintained their loyalty to the Revolution and were true to the spirit of revolutionary justice."

Marxists all agree, he continued, that one day in the future, in a fully Communist society, the State, as an instrument of coercive power, will disappear. But the period in the future when this will become a reality must be preceded by a period of the "affirmation of the law, the affirmation of socialist and revolutionary legality, and the disciplining of human conduct as part of living together in a new society".

"That is why", he explained, "we are now entering a period of the full affirmation of socialist legality through the creation of jurisdictional organs specifically designed to carry out this mission, to apply the law to the fullest and firmly to establish socialist legality."

President Dorticos outlined other measures envisaged to "guarantee the process of the progressive democratisation of the administration of justice."

There would be a developing participation of the working class and other sections of the people in the administration of justice. Lay judges, elected by the political and mass organisations, would participate in the Courts. The process must be continued:

> "The legislative process that has been initiated should continue. The new Criminal Law has already gone into effect, and the Civil Law is being worked on. The laws governing family relations will have to be revised, too, some day in the future; and, one day, there will have to be a new Civil Code. I think it will not be long before we should work, too, on the elaboration of a new Constitution."

ITALIAN COMMUNISTS ON THE ARMED FORCES

The Italian Communist Party issued at the end of July an important document on the Armed Forces.

The Constitution of the Italian Republic it stated, affirms that Italy repudiates war as a means to solve international disputes and that the Italian Armed Forces should be instruments for the defence of the independence of their country and of its democratic institutions. The experience of the Resistance and the contents of the Constitution indicated that the Armed Forces should have a popular basis and a democratic organisation.

The document shows that, since 1947, successive Italian Governments have departed from such conceptions.

Italian participation in the Atlantic Pact, cold war, NATO etc., have undermined the democratic organisation of the Armed Forces in the last 25 years, says the document, there has been a tendency to turn the Armed Forces into bodies separated from the democratic institutions of the country, there have been cases of threats to constitutional legality (like the SIFAR affair) and of fascist infiltration.

The Party put forward in the document a number of proposals for the legal reform of the position and organisation of the Armed Forces.

To Parliament must be restored its right of control of all aspects of military organisation. While supporting recognition of the right of "conscientious objection" which must be safeguarded in a democratic manner and preserved from abuse, the Party rejects the conception of a Professional Army. Compulsory military service should be rapidly reduced to 12 months. The period of service should cease to be for the Italian youth "a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

harmful interruption of their working and civil life, characterised by useless formal drill, made worse by an antiquated form of discipline, damaging to the citizen's rights and dignity."

New rules must guarantee the respect of the personality and rights of citizens in the Armed Forces. The system now in force of collecting information on the political opinions of both conscripted and career members of the Forces, must be strictly abolished. There must be no discrimination in the promotion to any rank, non-commissioned or commissioned. There must be radical revision of the whole organisation of military justice removing from it the remains of fascism and basing it on the conceptions of liberty and equality contained in the Constitution.

Completing its list of these and many other proposed reforms the Communist Party calls on all Italian democratic and popular forces to join with them in struggle for a Programme of Action for the democratic reform of the Armed Forces.

POLITICAL WRITINGS OF WILLIAM MORRIS

In *Political Writings of William Morris*, A. L. Morton has prepared for modern readers a volume long needed, a collection of William Morris's socialist lectures.[5] Published by Lawrence & Wishart in collaboration with Seven Seas Books, it forms a companion volume to the *Three Writings by William Morris* ("News from Nowhere", "Dream of John Ball" and "Pilgrims of Hope"), which is currently reprinting.

A. L. Morton explains that "in making my selection for this volume I have given 'political' the widest possible interpretation". The collection includes Morris's lectures about art. Indeed, Morris did not separate art from politics. For him, the end of socialist politics was to create a full and rich human life, and in this the role of the arts was of supreme importance.

Morris always laid an especial stress on the destructive effect of capitalist exploitation and greed on the whole material environment of man, and he saw in socialism the way to overcome this evil.

"That word art," he said, lecturing on *How We Live and How We Might Live*, "leads me to my last claim, which is that the material surroundings of my life should be pleasant, generous and beautiful. If every civilised community cannot provide such surroundings for all its members, it is a mere misery that man has ever existed. I feel sure the time will come when people will find it difficult to believe that a rich community such as ours, having such command over external Nature, could have submitted to live such a mean, shabby, dirty life as we do. And once for all, there is nothing in our circumstances save the hunting of profit that drives us into it."

Morris's lectures are very contemporary. It is to us in our own time and with our own problems that he speaks.

LITERATURE AND THE RISE OF CAPITALISM

In September, Lawrence & Wishart are publishing *Literature and the Rise of Capitalism*, by Raymond Southall.[6] Its five chapters make up an illuminating series of studies of the changes in outlook and in diagnosis of the human condition in the period from the Tudor Monarchy to the 18th century, the first phase of capitalist development in England.

Ray Southall, who lectures in English Literature at the University of Sheffield, takes off from More's *Utopia*. In his next chapter he presents a witty and very revealing account of the love poetry of the early Tudor period, with its "expensive" ladies of alabastar with hair of pure gold, highly valued for the costly materials of their composition and proclaiming the wealth of those who can acquire such goods. He then contrasts the change in sentiment evidenced by the harsh treatment of the corruption of human relations in Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida*.

There follow studies of John Donne, Ben Jonson and Thomas Hobbes—the treatment of Hobbes as a literary artist mirroring his times, rather than as a prosy philosopher, being strikingly original. The contrasting attitudes of two puritans in adversity after the end of the Commonwealth follow—John Milton and John Bunyan, with Bunyan emerging as the more positive of the two.

The last chapter is of great interest. Ray Southall deals with Dr. Samuel Johnson's criticisms of Shakespeare—who was regarded as in some respects a rather crude and rude writer—together with the same literary pundit's moralising novel *Rasselas*, which he sees as expressions of the new complacency and self-satisfaction of a bourgeois society

[5] *Political Writings of William Morris*, edited and with introduction by A. L. Morton. Lawrence & Wishart, 246 pages, paperback £1.

[6] *Literature and the Rise of Capitalism*, by Raymond Southall. Lawrence & Wishart, 175 pages, £2.50.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when it has got over the revolutionary upheavals of its birth.

URBAN POLICY

There can be no doubt that town planning is fast becoming a major issue in domestic politics. A recent Marxist analysis[7] of what has been happening in Paris, reviews the post-war plans for that city, which the French big bourgeoisie are currently trying to turn into the dominant financial centre of Western Europe. There are striking parallels with our experience in this country. Post-war "decentralisation"—the theme also of the Greater London Plan—has displaced some industries and increased the travelling and other problems of many industrial workers and their families, only to make way for acres of new office space which daily gorges and disgorges millions through a choked transport system. White-collar workers are forced to seek homes at impossible prices in ever more distant suburbs.

New roads ruthlessly displace homes and small businesses to ease communications to the business centres, only to exacerbate traffic and living conditions elsewhere. This, the writer argues, is symptomatic of a new division in social life: between *production* itself, *on the one hand, and its direction, on* the other. While the former is banished farther afield, the latter takes over the heart of the metropolis. All of this takes place within a political framework wherein the balance of class forces now tends to align all other classes against the dominant finance-capitalists and the international firms. The whole fashionable town-planning strategy of *zoning*—the segregation of different "land-uses" into different parts of the city—is questioned, and an "anti-segregationist urbanism" advocated in its stead.

It is this last point—the alternative strategy, and the tactics appropriate to its realisation—that clearly demands further elaboration, both here and in France. Although capitalism, however organised and directed, is inimical to working-class interest and is open to attack on every count, our socialist alternative cannot be couched in Luddite terms. There are advantages in large-scale undertakings and unified control which cannot be dismissed out-of-hand, and it is difficult to see how they can be reconciled with some kind of "de-segregated" town where everyone lives near his work. But there is clearly no reason why the depopulation of city centres, traffic jams and the run-down of public transport should any longer be accepted as inevitable consequences of "progress". In our July issue we published an article by W. H. Evans on these issues as they affect us in Britain today.

[7] *La politique urbaine dans la region Parisienne 1945-1972* by Jean Lodkine; Mouton, Paris, 1972.

THE "GRUNDRISSE" AGAIN

In relation to our note in the July issue on the Penguin edition of the "Grundrisse", we are informed by Margaret Mynatt (who is a member of the Editorial Committee and in overall charge of the administration and organisation of the work on the preparation of the Collected Works of Marx and Engels) that there is no "current" edition in German.

The German 1953 edition was withdrawn, she writes, and to her knowledge has been unobtainable for many years, in view of the discovery of massive errors in decypherment, some of cardinal importance, the correction of which, undertaken by German and Soviet specialists over many years, runs to some 130 typed pages.

All the corrections which have been made will be incorporated in the forthcoming Lawrence & Wishart edition which will form part of the Collected Works.

THE NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE

"Marxists in Medicine", the research and study group of the London Health Students Branch of the Communist Party, have just republished in pamphlet form, under the title of "The National Health Service in England and Wales", two excellent articles by Dr. Julian Tudor Hart, first published in 1971 in the November and December issues of *Marxism Today*.

The pamphlet can be obtained for 10p (postage included) from 27 Pearman Street, London, SE1. An earlier pamphlet published by the same group—"Take a Pill . . . The Drugs Industry Public or Private"—is still available.

THE DISCUSSIONS

Readers are asked to note that no further contributions will be accepted on the Lewis-Althusser discussion, though it is hoped to publish all those already received.

No further contributions on "Marxism and the Family" will be accepted after September 15th.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Document:

Today, More Than Ever, We Say No To Civil War! But We Stand Ready To Crush Any Sedition

Luis Corvalan

(We print below a Speech made at the Caupolican Theatre on July 8th, 1973, by Senator Luis Corvalan, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Chile.)

Chileans:
Beloved comrades:

Scarcely eight days ago, the country was assailed by an abortive coup d'etat. Known fascists and those of the ultra-Right had proclaimed, weeks before, their proposed overthrow of the Government. On Friday June 29th they tried to realise this sinister idea. Using tank forces, they intended to seize La Moneda, the Presidential Palace. The revolt was quickly contained, thanks to the prompt and determined action by the Commander-in-Chief of the army, the loyalty of the armed forces and the police, and to the manner in which the workers, as soon as they heard the news, entrenched themselves in the factories, ready to take part in the combat if the situation had required them.

The Entire Population Stood Firm

The voice of the Central Association of Workers and that of the President of the Republic, placed the whole population on guard. Obeying the instructions of their Central Association, the workers and employees took control of many factories and vital services. The universities barricaded themselves in their buildings. The fieldworkers stood ready to fight. The hospital workers and loyal people of other professions occupied their appropriate positions. Organised women and youth of the Left promptly mobilised. And the majority of those who had not voted for the Government, on March 4th, desired, in this critical moment, the failure of the revolt. In the streets at the centre of Santiago there were spontaneous demonstrations in support of the Government.

On that morning, when tanks were firing upon the Ministry of Defence, the hearts of Chilean mothers were filled with anguish. Women hurried to look for their children in the schools that still functioned, or in the stores where they had gone shopping. The children who were in the infant nurseries of the Ministry of Public Works, the State Bank, and other places of work near the incidents, sat terrified at the blasts of gunfire. And all the little ones, the sons of Chile who are taking their first steps in life, suffered the shock and emotional impact of these happenings.

Today We Vigorously Repeat: No to Civil War!

More than for us, the adults, we who enter the social struggle knowing the risks we take, more than for us, I say, for the mothers of Chile and for their sons, we Communists must stand now with more determination than ever, with more energy and more resolution to fight. The patriotic and revolutionary slogan must be: "No to civil war! No to fascism!"

When President Allende, the Central Association of Workers, Popular Unity and especially the Communist Party, denounced the dangers of factional war, the newspaper of the Clan Edwards and other reactionary voices denied it. They insisted that it was an invention of ours, a terrifying tale to daunt our enemies, or a smokescreen to conceal our difficulties. The President of the Senate said that we were stirring up "fantasies". Now, in the light of recent events, who can doubt the reality of this danger, and what say those who denied it?

Day by day, it becomes clear that the protagonists of the assault were not acting alone. Recently, after seeking asylum in the embassy of Ecuador, where sheltered those from Villadiego, the chiefs of the misnamed fascist movement, *Fatherland and Freedom*, indicated that there were many involved in the coup d'etat effort. The ramifications of this are not yet totally apparent. It is not our intention to accuse

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

half the population, but there is no doubt that there are many people thrown into the fray.

A Crime Against the State Cannot Go Unpunished

The directorate of the National Party declared the Government illegitimate, calling for civil disobedience and inciting the armed forces to take part in the revolt. Such declarations expose this party, and we must let the Military Office of Prosecutions unroll the entire skein and the state security organs take corresponding action. The crime committed against the state, the national security, the constitutional order and discipline of the armed forces cannot go unpunished. Chile demands the maximum penalty for the authors and instigators of this rebellious disturbance.

This will be publicly prepared. There is a history of continual accusations against ministries of state and administrations, against the political proclamations of the Supreme Court and the Contraloria (an autonomous control department), the insults against President Allende, the campaign of slander against the Commander-in-Chief of the army, General Carlos Prats Gonzalez, which culminated with the provocation and attempted lynching in the Avenida Costanera. These helped to create the desired climate for the attempted coup. Furthermore, the attempt to maintain a partial strike in El Teniente and to promote other similar movements, principally instigated by *El Mercurio*, also formed part of the conspiracy, although, albeit, those workers who were summoned to carry out these actions did not respond with any enthusiasm.

The Danger is Still Not Conquered

The defeat of the rebels is a great victory to the people, a triumph for Chile. But the danger is still not totally conquered, because the rebellion was only a demonstration of the policy coldly followed by the seditious Right. For this reason, the Communist Party calls for a permanent alert, and is not content to merely sleep on the laurels of our victory.

Avoidance of civil war, is and will continue to be, the principal political task of all Chileans, followers of the Government or not, who believe in the necessity of maintaining the class struggle, however acute it may be, at the level at which until today it has developed. For this we value not only the voice of the working class, of the women and the youth, of the parties of the Left, but also the words expressed by the Church and the rectors of the universities. We hope that the voices of one and all sincerely reject the shedding of blood.

Chile, Latin America, the land of the oppressed and exploited, has begun the march toward a better destiny. Whatever the course of events and temporary setbacks, this march will continue, for it is the march of history. But, as the rectors of the universities tell us: "Many tests demonstrate that we can achieve justice without breaking the moral unity of our state, nor the basic values of our nationality."

We comply, if not word for word, with the spirit that flows through such a declaration, from such high exponents of university culture and education.

The Chilean Revolution Can and Should Advance Without Civil War

Always we have maintained—and we repeat it today on the weight of recent successes—that in the conditions existing in Chile there is a real possibility to complete the anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchical revolution, and march forward to Socialism without civil war, although, naturally, maintaining an intense class struggle.

The enemy tries to completely wall up this possibility. We must do the opposite. While the wall is still not closed, we must work to keep it open and widen the breach.

This must be done in the interests of the people, of present generations and future, and of the state security. Civil war, in addition to bringing indescribable suffering, broken lives, and irreparable lost material, would in reality place Chile in a defenceless position, facing the guerrillas in the Andes, who, with the help of more affluent nations, dream of advancing upon our northern territory. So that those who seek the overthrow of the Government and lead the country into factional war, fall headlong into the treachery of the state.

Some of their agents operate from Bolivia, among them ex-major Marshall, and they are pledged to create an abyss between the armed forces and the people.

Faced with this, arises the utmost necessity to avoid the disintegration and weakening of the country by an internal conflagration.

As realistic and dedicated revolutionaries, we condemn the actions of a sector of the reactionary classes who do not place the interests of Chile above their shameful self-interest in maintaining their privileges.

Combat the Enemies Without Truce! Open Dialogue to all the People

It was said at one time, when British imperialism campaigned for its privileges, that capitalism had no native country and that its only banner was the pound Sterling. We can say of its present day disciples that the facts are only too clear. A section of the oligarchy has forsaken the interests of its country and only worships money, class privileges and foreign currency. For this reason, it is an illusion to believe in an understanding between absolutely all Chileans. An inevitable class struggle is developing in the country. Social harmony is impossible.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We cannot afford a truce with *El Mercurio*, Jarpa, Pablo H. Rodriguez, with those who wish to return the large factories to the antiquated imperialist industries, or with those who want to reverse or paralyse the transformation process of our agriculture. But dialogue must be opened within the people. There are some who are not followers of the Government, but nor do they support its overthrow. They are convinced that we should not return to the past, that changes are necessary, and civil war must be averted. With those who think in this way, yes, there can be dialogue, and eventually a mutual understanding.

We do not say that, for our part, all is done that is possible in this context. But the truth is that their presumptive spokesmen maintain an attitude of closed opposition, faced with which it is impossible to talk with them and, by the same token, they have no desire to reciprocate.

The Attitude of Christian Democracy

What has been, and remains, for example, the official attitude of Christian Democracy? Its president has said that he will not say a single word against the Government. But he is often seen in the company of Pablo Rodriguez's fascists. Furthermore, he has over-estimated his position. As soon as he assumed the presidency of his party, he said to the four winds that if by May 30th the JAP (Committee of Prices and Supply) had not been disolved, his party would boycott finance minister Millas and whoever succeeded him in responsibility of the post. Who then is in charge? Perhaps Senor Aylwin is the president of Chile?

When he concocted the "tacnazo" (attempted coup) in October 1969, and brought serious danger to the stability of the Christian Democrat Government, the workers, headed by their Central Association, went out into the streets to crush the rising sedition. The Government, in this instance, was not in sympathy with them. With it they encountered many problems, over questions of salary and for the policy of repression in trade union struggles. But the conscience, political clear-sightedness, and loyalty of the workers, brought about the downfall of that government. The Communist Party distinguished itself by a clear and determined attitude in this respect.

On that occasion, only one rebellious general managed to entrench, with one regiment. Things were less serious. But on this occasion, tanks arrived at the Presidential Palace and the Ministry of Defence. Despite this, the leadership of Christian Democracy did not mobilise any of its people. Only at midday, their president telephoned the head of state to confirm their adhesion to the constitutional regime; a small point in their favour. The Minister of Justice at the time of the "tacnazo", who now presides over the Senate, did not utter a word. In contrast, only days beforehand, he had been quick to express to the President of the Supreme Court, his strong support in face of the criticism and attacks upon the legal powers, not with tanks nor the use of force to impose a process of change, but with argument, and for the valid reason that a group of high magistrates had illegally pocketed money that should have been deposited in the vaults of the Social Security Service, for the payment of pensions to retired workers and the disabled.

What a marked difference between one case and the other, and between one political segment and another! This fact is now recognised by Christian Democrat workers, many of whom are now turning away to join the ranks of their class brothers.

The Power Conflict: a Reflection of the Class Struggle

There are those who support the idea of agreements between the various powers of state. A conflict of power exists. This is an indication of the class struggle taking place, backed by an Executive that is capable of introducing revolutionary changes, so much that the majority of the opposition have transformed Parliament into a reactionary stronghold, and the judiciary is also at loggerheads with the Government.

If the majority of Congress dedicates itself to making trivial accusations, promoting unconstitutional reforms of the constitution that bring about retrogression, ensuring the inadequacy of the laws of budget and readjustment, burying the projects of the Government, to secure definitively the limits of the various areas of ownership and throw out the economic crime project, then this will block any possibility of an understanding.

For the purpose of the last ministerial reorganisation, the President of the Republic made a gesture that could have opened the way towards better relations with the Christian Democrats. The Government wished to incorporate into the cabinet a rector of the Catholic University, Fernando Castillo Velasco; not as a representative of his party, but without requiring or hoping, far from it, that he should abandon his ranks. But this initiative could not prosper, faced with the sectarianism of those same people who speak against sectarianism.

The rectors of the non-state universities, to promote dialogue and look for "a minimum consensus of opinion", rightly stated that it was absurd that such a negative formula was advocated, "vainly pretending that they can turn back revolutionary progress". Deeds speak for themselves. The leadership of the Christian Democrats is displaying such a negative attitude.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dialogue and Ideological Struggle to Impede Artificial Division of Chile

Conversely, the main body of the country is wide open to the possibility of dialogue. Between workers, peasants, employees, technicians and other skilled workers, women and students, sympathetic or not towards the Government, the dialogue is necessary, moreover, a duty, and should be carried out by each one of us as part of our daily tasks. This is one of the most important ways to achieve the completion of that honourable objective, which is to unite our country, to avoid the artificial divisions between Chileans, who have a common interest and common enemies.

Included in this task must be discussion with even those young men who have adopted the pseudo-patriotic nationalist slogans of Pablo H. Rodriguez. The rebellious nature of youth can sometimes be misused. In the 1930s, numerous young people followed another fascist leader, Gonzalez Von Marée. But, in time, many of them opened their eyes and later changed to parties of the Left. For a long time, Pablo H. Rodriguez has presented the image of a courageous leader, prepared even to give his life in the struggle against the Government, and at the first sign of danger he disappeared, like a miserable coward, like a rat, to seek refuge in the embassy of Ecuador. This alone should awaken the consciences of many youngsters who followed him. And if from this awakening some arrive at positive conclusions, they must be helped. Nothing can be lost by conversing frankly when one has firm convictions, and with such dialogue that presupposes ideological struggle and shows our determination in the combat we face.

Total Power for the Service of the People

We wish to clearly establish, as we have said, that we shall not and cannot retract the institutional changes. The reactionaries accuse us of pursuing total power. Yes, sirs. We pursue total power—for the service of the people, each one to get his own share, while conforming to the limits fixed by the law, maintaining the wishes of the majority and recognising the rights of those who are opponents, always ensuring that their actions are within the valid legal framework, or within the limits declared. What sin is this?

If the dominating classes of yesterday had total power, why should the people not aspire to the same? It is correct to do so, and necessary to succeed in this way. A revolution should express itself in all spheres of life, in the structure and superstructure of a given society. All revolutions, past and present, were conducted in this manner. The bourgeois revolutions were, and likewise so should the revolution of the proletariat.

How can the legislative or legal power remain sound if, as we have said, they have been converted into strongholds of the enemies of progress, who cannot keep up with the changing times, smell of camphor and walk in spats?

Already, the accusations against ministers and administrators, presented to parliament throughout the duration of the Government, number almost 30. Amongst the three latest ministers to be accused, alongside Sergio Bittar, of the Christian Left, are the beloved comrades and militants of our Party, Orlando Millas and Luis Figueroa. Not in any of the frequent dismissals has any crime been proved. Nor have the legal powers themselves, with all their antipathy for the Government, been able, in any single case, to declare any of the dismissed ministers guilty. Each one of these accusations was a great lie designed to obstruct the work of the Government.

This comedy costs the country dearly. Thousands upon thousands of escudos have been spent on useless paperwork, in pay for supplementary hours by personnel, in working-lunches and dinners for deputies and senators who find this frivolity very entertaining. Meanwhile, as we have said, they refuse to legislate against the economic offenders, they postpone readjustments and encourage inflation by ensuring the inadequacy of the laws.

This alone is enough to conclude that a substantial change is necessary in the type of parliament we have.

Even more indispensable are the changes in the legal powers. They develop absolutely outside the national community. In reality they are self-perpetuating. Conforming to Article 86 of the Constitution, the Supreme Court has the direct control, corrective and economic, over all the courts of the nation, which means that it rules the course of justice. The members of the Supreme Court are proposed by the Supreme Court. When a vacancy occurs, a list of five names is prepared, of which the President of the Republic "proposes" one. But the list is formed by the names of the two eldest ministers of the Court of Appeal, who for certain will have the Supreme Court's confidence, and with another three names of candidates of sufficient merit, merit that is qualified by the very same Supreme Court, and arranged offstage. In these conditions only by accident could this celestial court admit anyone who did not have their blessing. And the final touch is that members of the Supreme Court remain in office for life, insomuch as the judges, to quote Article 85 of the Constitution, "remain in Office permanently, during their good conduct". And who qualifies this good conduct, if not, once again, the Supreme Court? In Chile it is harder for a person of the Left to make a career in law than for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle.

And why so much talk about the Contraloria (autonomous control dept.) of the Republic?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Enough said that, without the establishment of the Constitution, it would in practice have turned into another state power with similar characteristics to those of the Supreme Court, impossible to impose a limit upon its despotism and its conditions and life of office.

Yes, as they said in the past regime, everything must be changed. Why do they now defend these things, which are the essence of anti-democracy? The people will not renounce, nor could ever renounce, the necessary modifications to the institutions of the state.

For the Rights of the People We Need to Unite the Power of the People

We return to the introduction, to the recent events that have placed in evidence the real danger of civil war.

We have said and repeat today that we are doing, and will continue to do all that is in our power to avoid it. Dialogue within the boundaries that we have expressed, can and should contribute to this. But there is a section of the reactionary classes with which, as we have already said, there can be no dialogue or reasonable understanding. For this reason, for the rights of the people, we need to unite the power of the people. To accomplish this, the need arises to transform every factory, every farm, every public service, every community, every trade union, every organisation of the masses, into a bastion of the popular movement. Lenin said that every industrial establishment should be converted into a fortress of the revolution. For over a week, now, against the reactionary coup in Uruguay, the workers have barricaded themselves in their factories. From here we salute them, convey our complete solidarity, and declare that, against any new emergency, like the occurrence in these recent days, the Chilean proletariat will stand firm in their places of work and, as we have also said, if it is necessary to fight we will leave the factories and do so.

Nobody Has the Right to Equivocate: the People Will Face Their Enemies

We resolutely support the decisions of the Central Association of Workers, in their directions for the strengthening of the production committees of the industries and industrial chains, under the management of a rigid and common discipline. The proletariat must act with stability and responsibility, with burning hearts and cool heads. This is one of the basic conditions for its victory.

The workers keep the country moving and nobody can make it function without them, or against them.

We must be prepared for any circumstances, ready to fight on all grounds. If the reactionary sedition becomes greater, entering the realms of armed struggle, let nobody have any doubts that the people will promptly rise, as one man, to crush it. In such a situation, that we do not desire, that we do not seek, that we wish to avoid, but could nevertheless take place, nothing will be left, not even a stone, that we will not use as ammunition. In such an instance, the new alternative would be to defeat with the maximum speed and energy those who unleash civil war, and liquidate the event before it begins, to spare Chile the injuries and anguish of a prolonged conflict of this type.

The Enemies of the Armed Forces are in the Reactionary Camp

Just as the workers adopted immediate security measures against the recent attempted coup, and maintained these measures as a precaution, some reactionaries have begun to seek new ways to drive a wedge between the people and the armed forces, maintaining little less than we are intending to replace the professional army.

No, sirs! We continue to support the absolutely professional character of the armed institutions. Their enemies are not amongst the ranks of the people but in the reactionary camp.

The Communist Party, together with the other parties of Popular Unity and all revolutionaries willing to act under a single management, but responsibly and not as "free-marksmen", will place in the balance all the strength of its discipline, courage and organisation.

We think it right to notify the enemy, those who wish to launch into new seditious adventures. They shall not pass; and they will come out badly. As far as we are concerned, we can tell them that we stand on firm ground. In a short time we shall initiate the campaign for the counting of our members and supporters. On June 30th, before the commencing date for the renewal of our credential, 50 per cent of militants already held a Party card. A seeming phenomenon occurred to our beloved and gallant Communist Youth, who are accomplishing with success their agreement with Recabarren, which consists of saluting the next Congress of our Party with 100,000 members.

We are certain that the same spirit fills the other detachments of Popular Unity. Still more, we are convinced that one of the effects of this coalition, in the circumstances of which we speak, is that tens of thousands more combatants, without any party affiliations, are accumulating. The working class and the people in general display a pattern of stability that is always displayed by peoples who in such moments have no other dilemma but to conquer or die.

We do not wish to arrive at such a situation, not for ourselves, but for the people of Chile. But if it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is to be, the working class, the popular masses, Popular Unity and the Communist Party and Communist Youth will perform their duty.

Do Not Yield in the Constructive Tasks Towards Progress

We shall continue grasping the banner of struggle against civil war and gain strength to conquer the difficulties that run through the nation. The tasks that relate to production continue to be the order of the day. Part of the enemy's game is to distract our attention from the completion of these tasks. We shall not oblige them.

We are living in difficult times. This year is and will be particularly difficult, amongst other things, because agricultural production was a heavy fall on the last harvest and the price of copper has remained low since February. But the efforts being made by the fieldworkers and agricultural organisations permit us to forecast that we will achieve a significant increase in the next harvest. We are beginning to prepare the 1974 Economic Plan, with the active participation of the masses and, as you know, the price of copper has risen since March, recently exceeding 80 cents (US) per pound.

On the other hand, the new cabinet began its duties with an emergency plan to tackle the tasks of combating inflation and the black market. In the production battle, more and more initiative and determination is required. We need to continue resolving the problems of supply and distribution. We Communists are not accustomed, nor can we become accustomed to looking passively at the drama of queues, the shortage of bread and other supplies. We need to continue looking for solutions, large and small. The whole population must be diligent. This drama affects all the modest homes, including those of the military and police, and their wives and mothers must maintain an attitude of fraternal and human collaboration.

Continue With Strength the Mobilisation of the Masses

Those who seek the downfall of the Government and civil war, aggravate the problems and hope to create economic chaos to facilitate the consumation of their plans. Because of this, the maximum responsibility is needed in tackling the tasks of production and distribution. We must work harder. Not one factory protection measure should impede the smallest of the normal daily tasks.

Everyone must be at his combat position in a trade union, in the JAP, in the Mothers Centre, wherever they might be, fighting with the people for the people. That is our course.

The mobilisation of the masses must continue with more vigour. The demonstrations of June 21st and June 29th, the women's march against civil war and the ranks of youth marching from north and south upon the capital, in the Recabarren and Lautaro Columns, are glorious examples and indications that must multiply.

We are grateful for the many messages of international solidarity that have been received by the Government, the Popular Unity, the Central Association of Workers and also our Party. They indicate that the pages we are writing in the history of Chile are having world recognition, in the struggles of all people for peace, national independence, democracy, liberty and Socialism.

The full understanding of the significance of our struggle will be one more stimulus for our action.

—No to civil war!
—Fascism shall not pass!
—To unite forces to arrest factional war and prepare, if it occurs, to crush any sedition!
—To maintain and develop yet more combat mobilisation of the masses!
—To prepare throughout the country the commemoration of the twentieth anniversary of the just victory in Cuba on July 26th!
—To continue fortifying the Socialist-Communist unity, that over the recent months has achieved substantial advances!
—To fortify and develop still more the understanding between the general bodies integrated in Popular Unity!
—Long live the Popular Government and its revolutionary head, President Allende!
—Long live the Popular Unity!
—Long live the Communist Party!

(Translated by Gareth Thomas)

Challenge

Monthly Paper of the Young Communist League

September issue includes articles on—

World Youth Festival

Time to Change Course
(Discussion contribution by Christian Aid)

Racialism

Situation in Mozambique and Ireland

5p. per issue.

Available from Party Bookshops or by subscription £1.25p for 12 months from 27, Bedford Street, London, W.C.2.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Trends in Youth Culture: Some Aspects

Martin Jacques

(The article that we print below is based essentially on a Report given to an extended meeting of the Cultural Committee of the Communist Party held in February of this year. The author is a Lecturer in Economic History at Bristol University. He is a member of the Executive Committee of the Communist Party.)

I must begin this article with a number of qualifications and reservations. What follows is more or less the contents of a speech I gave to a meeting organised by the Cultural Committee on the above subject in February of this year. I have made only a few amendments to try and take into account criticisms that were made at that meeting and subsequently but essentially it remains what it was then, a rather hurriedly-prepared speech by a layman in the field. The latter has some significance. Youth culture is one of those subjects that everyone knows something about—from their own experiences—but no one seems to know much about, precisely because it is so recent, so large and so little written about. I am aware that I have failed to overcome many of these problems: the concept of youth culture remains generally vague and virtually always implicit; the category of youth is not explored sufficiently deeply while the examination of culture remains imbalanced. At the same time I have concentrated much of my attention on what might be described as the "critical" tendencies and have not dealt sufficiently with the position of industrial youth, partly as a consequence. However, warts and all, it is presented in an effort to stimulate what might be a politically useful discussion.

Introduction

The last decade has witnessed a massive revolt by the youth generation. Of course the "rebellion of youth" as such is nothing particularly new. However this specific rebellion has been of a scale, dimension and quality quite different from anything previously experienced in the advanced capitalist countries and particularly Britain. On a whole number of different fronts young people have come into conflict with bourgeois society, its authorities, values and institutions. Perhaps the best-known area of this challenge concerns the explicitly progressive stance taken by a very significant minority of youth on such overtly political questions as; the role of imperialism in the underdeveloped world and, above all, Vietnam, the almost spontaneous demonstration of internationalism, opposition to racialism, the undemocratic system of power in the institutions of higher education and growing forms of involvement in and solidarity with working class struggle.

But the challenge has not been confined to such explicitly political issues. Youth's disenchantment with capitalist society has been equally, indeed perhaps even more strongly, expressed at a cultural level, on such questions as traditional puritanical sexuality, the boring character of most people's work, the elitism and irrelevance of most "highbrow" culture, the meaning of freedom, orthodox approaches to sanity and madness and the way they are treated, the bureaucratic control of information, the consequences of commercialism, the oppression of women, the showbiz "star" phenomenon and so on. Indeed, much of the challenge has been directed at objects and taken forms which are not only relatively new but which the Marxist left had perhaps traditionally regarded as, at least, secondary.

Nevertheless, it is clear that this revolt, in all its aspects, is of considerable significance for Marxists: not least, we need to understand its origins, development and nature, including the relationship between its political and cultural elements, in order to correctly estimate its character and thereby establish how the party and the Young Communist League in particular should relate and respond to it.

The Nature of Youth

I suppose the first question we should pose is to what extent is it valid to speak of "youth", of a separate and distinct category defined by age-group. Here I am not thinking of the various theories of youth as a class which emerged during 1967-8 either explicitly or more often implicitly, but rather the problem as it confronts Marxists, given the concept of class embraced in historical materialism. The correctness of the insistence on the distinctness of each new generation seems to me to lie in the fact that each generation matures in a new set of political, economic, social and ideological conditions.[1] They

[1] S. Carrillo, "Problems of Socialism Today", 1970, p. 111-115.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thus share in some degree or other various common experiences and therefore expectations and values which are different from those of other generations.

The degree to which this is true is not always the same: rather it depends on the extent and manner in which these new circumstances are different from the ones experienced by the older generations. In particular, one might argue that the greater the disparity, the more striking will be the generational differences and consequent disharmony and even conflict.

I want to argue that this disparity has been a very marked, even dramatic feature of the post-war generation in three senses: (1) the ideological framework (2) the numerical and material position of youth (3) its social composition. By "ideological framework" I mean the totality of its experiences and expectations. The contrast here is clear. The first truly postwar generation (i.e. that born in or after 1945) was never confronted with the twin problems which dominated the lives of the previous generation, namely mass unemployment and fascism. Rather it came to accept a state of relatively full employment and rising living standards (together with all the other changes) as normal and thus judge the performance of bourgeois society by rather different standards to those that might be employed by people who lived through the 1930's.

My second point is that the "weight" of youth in society—as expressed in both numerical and economic but also social terms—has greatly increased. A number of factors have combined to produce this change. Although the percentage of the population between the ages of 15 and 24 has not changed very significantly since the war (such a change would require very sharp movements in the birth and death rates), the absolute number in that age group did increase by 24 per cent between 1951 and 1969.[2] This, together with various socio-economic developments such as the growth in the educational sphere, the increased income and therefore spending capacity of working youth[3] and the declining role of the family, have combined to increase the economic, political, social and ideological autonomy and influence of youth as expressed, for example, in such diverse phenomena as pop music, clothes and sexual norms.

In this context it is perhaps important to underline the point about autonomy. These developments have taken forms and had effects which have meant that youth has not just shared in the changes affecting other sections of the population but rather has tended to experience and articulate them in distinct ways and in separate areas and institutions as expressed, for example, in the expansion of the educational sphere and in the various modes and organisations of cultural activity.

Social Composition

Finally we come to the third factor the social composition of youth. Since both the forces and relations of production are in a constant process of development and reproduction, the composition of the working class is itself subject to a continual process of change. The most marked feature of this process since the war has been the growing importance of various strata of technical, scientific and intellectual labour within wage-labour.

While these tendencies are apparent from the statistics for the working class as a whole, they are very much more marked for the most recently recruited sections of wage-labour, that is, for example, for those in the 15-25 age-group. This trend not only varies from one branch of industry to another but also, as a consequence, from one area to another, being most marked in a place like London where there is a large distribution, entertainment, banking and financial sector for example. Thus, when we speak of working-class youth we should bear in mind that this category now embraces what are in some respects very diverse areas and types of employment, with very different traditions, work-situations, degrees of organisation, educational training etc.

There is another factor, however, related to the above, that has had an important effect on the social composition of youth, namely the expansion in further and higher education. In 1970-71, of the eight million young people between the ages of 15 and 24, over ¾ million were in the higher and further education sector with over one million in the 15-18 age-group at school. The picture that thus emerges is that over 20 per cent of the 15-24 age group were full-time students of one kind or another, in 1970-71, compared with nearly 18 per cent in 1966-7 and 14 per cent in 1961-2.[4]

Thus the social composition of youth has changed in at least two important respects. Firstly, the composition of working class youth is now more

[2] From "Annual Abstract of Statistics", 1972.

[3] Although youth is one of the most exploited sections of the working class, one should not underestimate the "leisure-time" spending capacity of the single working boy or girl living at home or the effect of paper rounds, Saturday jobs etc., for school students; e.g. E. J. Hobsbawm, "Industry and Empire", 1968, p. 244.

[4] These figures are only approximate and have been compiled from; "Annual Abstract of Statistics", 1972, pp. 8, 11; "Statistics of Education", Part Two, 1961, pp. 23, 63; "Social Trends", No. 3, 1972, pp. 123, 131. This proportion is of course still increasing and the effect of raising the school-leaving age to 16 will be important in this context. Further, these figures do not include sandwich courses, day-release etc., but this is another factor to be born in mind.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

diverse and while industrial youth undoubtedly remains the most crucial group politically, the various new sections are becoming increasingly important numerically. Secondly, students, who of course overwhelmingly later join the ranks of wage-labour themselves, are now a very much more important element amongst young people than was previously the case. This trend has many consequences. Not least, however, it has meant that the social distance between student youth on the one hand and working class youth on the other has considerably narrowed, while growing sections of the latter have also been through at least some stages of the further/higher educational process, a factor which further contributes to this narrowing. The point should not be exaggerated, there is still an enormous gulf between the student at Oxbridge and the engineering apprentice in Glasgow, but between extremes, as it were, the tendency is apparent and the implications are important. In particular, there is a growing cross-fertilisation of ideas and modes of behaviour between the different strata of youth.

Oppression of Youth

However, not only must we consider the particular features of the post-war youth generation in comparison with previous generations but also its precise position within society and therefore the particular forms which its oppression takes. The latter have become increasingly clear as the youth movement and youth culture have developed over the past decade and embrace a number of different spheres and problems.

Firstly there is the economic aspect: working youth constitutes one of the most exploited sections of the working class, often, for example, receiving lower wages for doing the same amount of work as their elders. Moreover youth, especially that majority who do not go into higher education, often face the prospect of relatively boring, monotonous jobs with perspectives for the future which promise little change. Indeed, in some respects there has been a sharpening of the contradiction between what young people expect of society in terms of jobs and what in concrete terms they actually find.

Secondly there is the educational element: although there has been an enormous expansion in the educational sphere, which remains essentially the sphere of youth, this expansion has taken place within the general limits of how the bourgeoisie sees the role of education. In particular, for example, there is the continual pressure, expressed in a whole number of different ways, to reduce the educational process to those elements which are essential for the production of the particular type of wage-labour required. This is only a tendency of course, not to be interpreted in too rigid a way, but it does, nevertheless, represent a very important pressure in all spheres of education.

Thus, although education has helped to raise the general cultural level, its very organisation and character have at the same time tended to limit the cultural and intellectual development of youth, in stressing, for example, the "received" nature of knowledge and the passivity of the receiver.

Thirdly there is an important social question, namely the problem of the family. While this is a complicated question, the family is clearly significant in this context because it is one of the most important agencies in "conditioning" children and youth and in socialising them into acceptance of the external values of society. To the extent that many of the older generation not only accept but also teach certain values which are old-established and regressive, then children and young people may face a certain "oppression" within the family and this in itself can reinforce the generational overtones of the initial stages of rebellion, which is itself to some extent acted out within the family.

Fourthly, there is the cultural aspect which should really be taken in conjunction with the educational aspect. As a result of the growth in leisure activity/expenditure etc. there has been an enormous expansion of the "cultural industry" since the war which has meant that the latter has assumed a much greater general significance. In this context, the cultural structures in advanced capitalist society are characterised by, amongst other things, two fundamental features. Firstly, in the continual drive to turn anything marketable into a commodity, the cultural field has itself become dominated by commodity production such that people are treated only as markets and individuals, in their cultural needs, only as consumers, with the consequent emphasis therefore on built-in obsolescence, fashions and fads. Secondly, the ideologico-cultural effect of this cultural industry is therefore manifested in the tendency to turn the individual into a passive "receiver-consumer" in a similar, though more marked, way to the tendency which operates within the educational sphere.

I want to draw two brief conclusions from this rather sketchy discussion of the oppression of youth. Firstly, the degree to which cultural tendencies are progressive cannot be judged solely in terms of their content (e.g. how revolutionary are the words of a song?) but must also take into account their form, that is the extent to which they imply an emphasis on participation, on the active involvement of the individual/audience in new ways and at different levels. Indeed, precisely because of the nature of the cultural structures of capitalism and the specific oppression of youth, it was always likely (and necessary) that youth would assert its rebellion through finding ways and forms of cultural in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

volvement and moreover, as a consequence, that its cultural rebellion would, especially in its early stages, bear the marks of individualism and subjectivism.

Secondly, within this broad framework of youth's oppression, aspects of which I have neglected (e.g. the political), each section of youth, depending on its socio-economic position etc., suffers particular kinds of oppression which, though manifestations in one way or another of class society sometimes only become clearly apparent through the struggles that develop around them. An example of this point is the specific oppression of young women in most spheres of society including job and educational opportunities as well as the more general ideological discrimination which underpins them.

The Fifties

In some degree each of the characteristics of the post-war generation mentioned earlier began to appear in the late 50's but it was not until the 60's that they really reached maturity. It was not until 1963, for example, that the oldest of the first truly post-war generation attained the age of 18 while the major expansion of higher education was only launched in the early 60's with the implementation of the Robbins Report. Certainly, however, the symptoms of the changes to come surfaced in the 50's with, for example, the rock n' roll upsurge of 1955-7[5], the skiffle phenomenon and, more than simply a symptom, with the development of the Aldermaston marches and the peace movements in the late 50's and early 60's. In fact the latter already prefigured some important characteristics of the youth movements of the 60's and 70's; its concern for international questions, its primarily youth character, its resort to new forms of political action and its close links with the sub-cultures of folk music, trad jazz and later rhythm and blues.

For reasons I cannot really discuss here, however, the CND did not survive as a mass movement. Nevertheless its demise did not lead to the rejection of those of its characteristics I have listed above but rather their development and refinement. Moreover at a more general level, in its challenge to the politics of the cold war and perhaps implicitly bourgeois democracy, CND did to some extent help to undermine, at least amongst sections of young people, the ideological straitjacket which was such a marked feature of British politics in the 50's.

The Group Phenomenon

I now want to shift the focus of my attention away from the political to the cultural front. In 1963-4 there occurred an explosion which not only changed the whole face of youth culture in Britain, but also had much wider political, social, ideological and cultural ramifications, namely the emergence of rock and roll in a new form as embodied in such groups as the Beatles, the Stones, The Who and the Animals.

At a general level, the causes of this explosion lay in the maturing of the conditions I spoke of earlier concerning the nature of the post-war youth generation. However, more specifically, the concrete forms it actually took were closely related to the political and cultural consciousness of youth at that juncture. Although limited sections of youth had begun to explore new political avenues, there was no sharp dislocation between the political consciousness of the mass of youth and their elders. Rather, the dislocation was to be found essentially at a cultural level, as is generally the case with generational differences, and more particularly in the contradiction between the growing autonomy of identity, attitudes and interests of young people and the almost complete absence of cultural outlets which were specifically "youth" in character and composition.

The most obvious field in which this pressure was likely to make itself felt was music. It is at once an easily comprehensible and highly evocative art-form in which participation is possible at many different levels. Moreover, the growth in the sales of records and gramophone equipment, consequent upon various technical advances together with the general rise in living standards, had made "pop music" into a mass cultural phenomenon and therefore an obvious vehicle for the expression of youths' feelings and aspirations.

At this time, however, the state of pop music was characterised by a relatively synthetic product which fostered and depended upon a relatively passive record-buying audience. It was a situation which had gradually evolved after the decline of rock n' roll and skiffle and, in the absence of any particularly strong pressures from the young, was the "artistic" product of the commercial deadhand of the four big record companies together with the attitude of the BBC and ITV.

With no means of access to either recording or broadcasting, any new musical trends were in the first instance inevitably "underground" in expression and this indeed was largely the form taken by the socio-musical sub-cultures of folk music, trad jazz and R and B at that time. The latter was perhaps the most heterogeneous in social composition and certainly by 1962, in cities like Liverpool, Birmingham, Manchester and Newcastle, it commanded a large following amongst working class youth.[6] The

[5] Indeed some of these expressions were similar to what happened in the sixties, but they were smaller in scale and largely "inspired" by American developments; C. Gillett, "The Sound of the City", 1971, pp. 18, 294-5.

[6] C. Gillett, *op cit*, p. 301.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

music thus represented both an autonomous expression of and in some degree, an inarticulate revolt by youth. When the big record companies finally caught on, despite their initial reluctance, the music already had a widespread if localised following.

The social character of the music was reflected and expressed in its content and form. In comparison with the synthetic pre-packaged products of tin pan alley at that time, which were very often "fifties American" in flavour, the new music drew heavily on the urban black music of the United States epitomised by such performers as Chuck Berry: as such it was loud, assertive, sensual and communicative. It was the sound of a new generation which was finding its voice, establishing its identity and stating its claims. And to the extent that it encountered reluctance and opposition from society at large, including from older generations, so the music (and its cultural counterparts like long hair and increasingly bizarre clothes) became a vital mode of expression of youth and of a reinforced youth consciousness.

There is perhaps another aspect which is worthy of mention here. Because the exponents of the new music, as epitomised by the Beatles, were often self-confident, articulate, assertive and virtually always from working class backgrounds, so the mood of rebellion and implicitly class rebellion which this music expressed was reinforced. Indeed it is interesting to note that this element of specifically class antagonism occurred more strongly in 1963-5 than was the case in the more explicitly political period of rock culture in 1966-9 and unquestionably this was closely related to the socio-cultural origins of rock music, notably the "closeness" of the new groups to their audiences and therefore their ability to express the mood and feelings of shared experiences, a quality which tended to decline as groups like the Beatles became separated from their social and cultural backgrounds.

Towards 1967

Between 1964 and early 1967, two particular features are evident in the development of youth culture. Firstly the music, which continued to occupy the centre of youth culture, displayed a marked capacity for musical and artistic growth: on the one hand it increasingly drew on other musical forms such as the blues, soul, folk, jazz and classical while, on the other hand, the lyrics moved away from the traditional preoccupations of pop music ("love" etc.), largely through the influence of Dylan, thus enabling the music to articulate the evolving mood of youth not only through rhythm, intensity of sound, melody and instrumentation but also through words.

Secondly, the development of rock music was by no means confined in its effects to the narrowly musical sphere nor even to those areas which had been most closely associated with the music like dress, hair, record sleeves, dance and drugs.[7] By 1966 there were wider ramifications which reached their apogee in 1967. Just as the music itself had transcended previously established musical categories, so the changes which had been wrought in this art-form began to influence and interact with other art-forms such as films, art and poetry. And beyond this, as a further development of this trend, the whole movement began to achieve a certain comprehensiveness and coherence which resulted in the wide use of such labels as "counter-culture", "alternative culture" and "underground". It in fact had acquired, by this time, not only its own music but also its own philosophy, its own ideology, its own press (IT, Oz etc.)[8] and its own institutions (open-air pop festivals etc.): it had become explicitly politico-cultural in character. The climax of these developments was reached in 1967 with the so-called "San Francisco" summer when rock culture and many of those involved in it came to "reject" a large part of the values, standards and institutions of bourgeois society and at the same time pose—even act out—an alternative. Obviously we are dealing here with a highly variegated and amorphous phenomenon—cultural movements can never, for example, be defined as neatly or as clearly as political movements—but it remains true that large sections of student youth and certain sections of working class youth were influenced by the concepts and components of that alternative, of building an "alternative" society, of "dropping out", of "doing your own thing", of experimentation with drugs and of the validity of Indian mysticism.[9]

Class and Youth Culture

At this point it is important to relate the propositions I made earlier about the nature of youth to the question of class. Amongst the implications of those propositions are firstly that there is a specifically youth identity viz-a-viz other generations and secondly that under certain circumstances a youth consciousness can develop which may on the one hand actually embrace different classes (or sections of classes) and on the other hand create generational divisions which override a common class situation. In some measure this is precisely what happened in the sphere of youth culture and particularly rock music during the period between

[7] For example, G. Melly, "Revolt into Style", 1972, Section Two.

[8] The circulation of these two papers was probably well over 30,000 (each) at their height.

[9] And especially its trappings, namely beads, bells, love, flower-power etc. In general see, for example, J. Nuttal, "Bomb Culture", 1970, Ch. 5, Melly, *op cit*, R. Neville, "Playpower", 1971.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1963 and 1967. That is, an unusual homogeneity, embracing much of both student youth on the one hand and working class youth on the other, was an important characteristic of the youth culture which emerged in the early 1960's.

The causes of this homogeneity lay partly in the general politico-ideological situation (relatively low level of struggle of the working class etc.) in which youth emerged, for the reasons I related earlier, for the first time as an autonomous socio-cultural group in the post-war context. This homogeneity thus depended on both the general political situation and the degree of development of the youth movement and of youth culture.

This degree of development is expressed through and reflected in both the form and content of youth culture. In general one can say that this homogeneity is usually at its greatest in the sphere of pop music and, as a consequence, was more widely the case when the music was itself the extant focal point within youth culture. As a rider, we might add that the more relatively simple and straightforward the music, providing of course it is not totally drained of "meaning", the more capable it is of performing this role.

All these conditions were true of the period between 1963 and early 1967: the music dominated youth culture and, despite its mushrooming diversity, remained largely within a fairly clear and definable framework. But at the same time each of these conditions was becoming less true: other cultural expressions were acquiring importance alongside the music whilst the latter was becoming increasingly complex and ever more dependent on the recording studio for its production and the record for its communication. Thus, even the music itself, as expressed by such "pop-leaders" as the Beatles (Sergeant Pepper) and the Rolling Stones (Satanic Majesties), while arguably attaining higher artistic standards, at the same time became less potent in its mass appeal. It could no longer evoke and command the same kind of "across-the-board" spontaneous and emotional response: the lyrics were more complicated, the rhythm less dominant and thus the relationship between the performer and the audience more individual and reflective.

In 1967, of course, youth culture reached the point of no return as far as this homogeneity was concerned. Although both the music and the wider cultural phenomena of that year (and indeed subsequently) did influence an important section of working class youth as well as student youth, it is nevertheless evident that the process of development through which pop music had passed had, by this time, reached a stage where its mainstream could no longer command the same kind of mass appeal as it had previously. Moreover, the philosophy of the movement, embracing both the creation of "alternative" institutions and a drop-out ideology, whatever its superficial attraction, inevitably had less concrete appeal for those sections of youth, particularly the mass of industrial youth, for whom it was so obviously at best a pipe-dream. However, this was not so obviously the case for either student (and sixth-formers) or various "white-collar" (as well as "lumpen") sections of youth and amongst these it exercised a considerable influence for several years.[10]

Political Developments

Before moving to any overall assessment of 1967/8, which clearly represented an important stage in the development of both the youth movement and youth culture, I want to discuss the more overtly political developments amongst youth between 1963 and 1968. It is perhaps worth beginning by recalling the generational model with which I introduced the talk. By the early 60's the various changes had become much more complete: the first truly post-war generation had reached its late teens, the expansion of higher education was under way and, finally, the new generation both witnessed and participated in the first major transformation of the politico-ideological environment since the early 50's, namely the termination of 13 years of Tory rule with the election of a Labour Government and what was to produce the ultimately decisive breach in the ideology of the cold war, namely the Vietnam war.

The failure of the Labour Government, especially after the 1966 General Election, destroyed the hopes and illusions of wide sections of youth and helped to produce a profound disenchantment and growing hostility to reformism. However the Vietnamese war had an even greater impact than the experience of the Labour Government, though the breadth and intensity of this reaction has always been most marked and concentrated amongst the student youth. For the first time significant sections of young people increasingly saw a national liberation struggle not just in terms of peace, which was still the tendency in the Cuban missile crisis, for example, but in terms of a war of national liberation, in terms of the barbarity of imperialism and the heroism and validity of the NLF.

The Vietnam war in fact had two obvious consequences. Firstly, it was largely responsible for changing the international outlook of large sections of youth, at least in their view of imperialism and the third world, if not as yet in their view of the socialist world. Secondly, the example and methods of the Vietnamese struggle, particularly the Tet offensive, exercised a profound influence on the

[10] For in some respects a very critical view of 1967 etc., "7 days", No. 5, 24-30 Nov. 1971, pp. 18-19, but also No. 6, 1-7 Dec., p. 18.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

attitude of significant sections of students towards the nature of British capitalism and the forms which the revolutionary struggle at home might take.

Thus, by 1967 and 1968 we witnessed amongst these sections not only widespread support for socialist revolution, bitter opposition to imperialism and in some degree perhaps an acceptance of the revolutionary role of the proletariat but also, partly as a result of the crude transplanting of the Vietnamese model into British conditions, a tendency towards the worship of violent methods, an undue emphasis on voluntarism and an overestimation of the stage reached. These developments, both in their strengths and their weaknesses, were exemplified by the events of 1968, notably the two national Vietnam demonstrations, the response to the May events in France and the various student struggles of that year.

Ideology and Rebellion in 1967/8

As I have suggested, 1967/8 marked an important stage in the development of the youth movement. It is perhaps difficult to separate out these years in any precise way because they were so closely intertwined, but it would appear that 1967 marked that point in youth culture and 1968 in youth politics.[11] It was a time when significant sections of youth, especially students and sections of "white-collar" youth, notably in cities like London, tended towards a spontaneous rejection of existing authorities and institutions and the advocacy of something completely new and different, of a new society. But it was of the most vague kind: there was no agreed conception of the type of society which was wanted—except to some extent amongst the "politicos"—and even amongst them there was no agreement about how to get it, about strategy. Clearly the ideology—or more correctly the ideologies—of this rebellion merit closer examination.

Let us firstly consider the politico-cultural phenomenon, the quest for an "alternative society", which in important respects reached its climax in 1967. This was certainly a revolt against many aspects, values and institutions of bourgeois society; against prevailing concepts of sexuality and the family, against the role of imperialism in the underdeveloped world, against the bureaucratic control of information, concern for the environment and so on. If this is in any serious doubt then one only has to examine copies of *IT* and *OZ* from this period. But how was this opposition to bourgeois society expressed and how was the latter to be fought?

Essentially here the analysis always put the individual first, as expressed for example in the phrase "do your own thing". The concept of class and class struggle was either absent, totally misconceived (i.e. youth=the revolutionary class) or very secondary. Before society could be changed the individual must be changed and in the process of changing the individual through dropping-out, the creation of communes etc., somehow the present society would be destroyed and replaced by the new.

The sanctity of the individual also involved opposition to repression and in particular therefore opposition to the state and especially its main coercive agencies like the police whose role was seen as the enforcement of laws which prevented the free development and self-expression of the individual. Likewise, one can see how the use of drugs and the resort to forms of mysticism and religion, be it some Indian guru or Jesus Christ, were, in the main, but an expression of this preoccupation. The point I am trying to make is that both the philosophy and the ideology of much of the "underground" movement stood in very sharp contrast to Marxism: its philosophy was essentially idealist and its ideology anarchist or, more accurately, utopian-anarchist.[12]

That is not in any way to dismiss it or to condemn it out of hand. The ideologies of classes and fractions of classes moving into a position of rebellion take shape in a society where the dominant ideology is that of the ruling class. In capitalist society the dominant ideology is essentially bourgeois individualism and this ideology, in particular its emphasis on individualism, has left its mark on both the working class and student movements during their process of emergence into more independent and "oppositional" social forces, being reflected for example in the influence of anarchist tendencies at certain historical moments. The latter are, in fact, often a sign of developing but still immature rebellion. In that light it is essential to see both the positive and negative aspects of the underground, neither to welcome it uncritically nor to dismiss it out of hand.

These points are in fact particularly apposite in relation to the underground. Firstly the latter was essentially a politico-cultural rather than a political movement and hence even more amorphous and variegated than might otherwise have been the case. Secondly, because of the whole nature and development of the youth movement, not only were the political and cultural elements closely interwoven, but so too were the competing ideologies within each, Marxism representing the other main ideological tendency in the "protest" movement besides anarchism.

[11] "1968" did of course help to "politicise" some of those trends initiated in 1966-7.

[12] Useful in this context is Gil Green, "The New Radicalism: Anarchist or Marxist?", 1971.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Question of the State

The second feature in fact becomes immediately evident from the briefest of examinations of the politics of 1968. There was the preoccupation with the state, or more correctly its coercive elements, and therefore with the question of the state essentially in the abstract. There was the related concern for violent methods, indeed sometimes a tendency towards the worship of the deed, of the heroism of the act.

There was the fundamental distrust of organisations and leaders which expressed itself in a whole number of different ways, not least in a contempt for the existing organisations of the working class movement and a hostility towards anything but the most temporary and *ad hoc* bodies, which have in fact been a feature of the last six to seven years, particularly in the student movement, though less so now.

In this context I might add one final point. Perhaps the most single influential organisation amongst the student militants who turned to revolutionary politics in 1968 was IS and yet, of all the political organisations on the left, IS was the closest to anarchism or at least anarcho-syndicalism and libertarianism. It was in fact, at least at that stage, a strange combination of neo-Marxism, bourgeois sociology, Trotskyism and anarcho-syndicalism as expressed, for example, in its rank and filism, its theory of bureaucracy, its concept of state-capitalism and in its own internal structure.

In speaking of the ideologies of "rebellion" I should perhaps emphasise that these were most influential and concentrated amongst certain sections of youth; in particular student youth, to a lesser extent "white-collar youth" and sixth formers and only to a very much more limited extent to industrial youth. Although the latter were very much engaged in the youth culture and especially musical developments prior to early 1967, the direction taken by the then mainstream of pop music in that year began to seriously weaken its appeal for growing numbers of industrial youth (and their counterparts at school) while still smaller sections of them were influenced by the wider politico-cultural aspects and only a very small number by the explicitly political tendencies. Indeed, the ideology of much of industrial youth remained either relatively reformist and economist or, and this was perhaps even more widespread, essentially "apolitical".

The Causes of 1967/8

At this point I want to pose the question: why did large sections of the youth movement take these forms and display these characteristics in 1967/8 and, more generally, in the second half of the 60's, given the points I made earlier on the nature of post-war youth?

The first factor concerns the position of the working class. When the youth movement of the early 60's emerged it was at a time when the working class was not particularly militant, giving at least the appearance to some sections of youth of having been integrated and incorporated into the capitalist system, a view which seemed to them justified by the behaviour of the right-wing leaderships of its mass organisations, particularly the Labour Party and the TUC. In such circumstances, the working classes could not really become the pole of attraction for the other movements of rebellion and protest. This was particularly true in the case of the youth movement because it was exclusively composed of a generation which had never seen anything different and therefore had come to accept this as the norm: moreover, the social composition of youth in itself tended to weaken the influence which the traditional labour movement had on it, a factor which was further reinforced by the low level of trade union organisation amongst young industrial workers.[13]

This "absent centre" inevitably tended—by default—to foster two tendencies. Firstly, it encouraged a belief, at least amongst wide sections of student and working class youth, in some concept of youth as a separate and distinct social group, certainly at a cultural level but even, amongst smaller sections, at a political level. In both instances, of course, generational conflict was in some degree counterposed to class conflict. And secondly, a belief, at least amongst an important section of militant students, that somehow or other—and not necessarily in an explicitly Marcusian sense—students now represented some kind of political vanguard.

I would emphasise, however, that the position and mood of the working class was only one factor, albeit a very important one, in determining the shape of the youth movement and youth culture. Even in countries like France and Italy, where the most powerful political organisations of the working class are Marxist, the youth movement still displayed many of these characteristics though, on the whole, their respective youth cultures tended to be more overtly political.

Students

A second factor which helped to shape the youth movement and the youth culture of the late 60's was the social composition of youth and particularly the significance of students within it. I have not got time here to make any balanced and rounded analysis of the student movement, either in general or in 1968, but clearly this question needs some consideration for, as Gil Green points out with

[13] And indeed the relatively small size of the political youth organisations of the labour movement and the left.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

some truth, "it is especially amongst college youth that the modern mode of youth consciousness takes on its more extreme forms and its own life."[14] In what ways is the student body distinct and unique?

Firstly students bear a special but essentially transitory relationship to the means of production in which they are not directly exploited and, moreover, on the one hand are freed from their immediate home background and on the other hand have not yet acquired the kind of responsibilities and problems which, in a capitalist society, are an inevitable product of work, marriage, children and so on. Secondly, students on the whole tend to live in fairly closed communities and this in itself tends to encourage a certain student consciousness.

In these senses—and others as well—a distinctly student culture is fostered not only in relation to the educational institution and its authorities but also in relation to the rest of society including the working class. This consciousness embraces both certain political attitudes on the one hand and various distinct cultural notions on the other concerning such questions as sexual attitudes, clothes, personal relationships etc. The latter have often had importantly progressive elements but they have frequently also tended to reinforce the concept of the separateness of youth and also to be expressed in a very individualistic manner.

These tendencies were further strengthened by a number of important political and social features of the student movement which I can mention only briefly here. The fact that only about 25 per cent of the students in the university sector, which was the then dominant sphere within higher education, came from industrial working class backgrounds meant that the majority of students had no experience nor little conception of the character of the industrial working class and the nature and demands of its struggles. Moreover, as far as the students' own college struggles were concerned, the line between victory and defeat was generally less clear than in industrial struggles. This, together with both the class background of students and the total and concentrated nature of their situation (making mobilisation easier etc.) made organisation of any disciplined and formal character less necessary and was therefore often regarded as actually undesirable. We should note however that all these things are undoubtedly less true now than they were in 1968, not least because the "modern" student movement was still in its infancy then with no clearly-developed strategy, little history and virtually no memory.

Nevertheless, by its very character, the nature of its social being, the student body is relatively prone to a certain political and cultural consciousness which, amongst other things, makes it more susceptible to tendencies like subjectivism, individualism, leftism, libertarianism and anarchism in rather the same way as the working class is susceptible to economism.

[14] G. Green, *op cit*, p. 10.

International Situation

Another factor which helps to explain in particular the political character of the youth revolt in the late 60's concerns the international matrix of forces. In view of the almost spontaneous feeling of internationalism demonstrated by many young people, this factor possesses a special importance and was most concretely expressed in the latter's response to the struggles of the oppressed peoples in the colonies and neo-colonies, struggles which were along roads that were essentially and necessarily new. The significance of the point is made only by recalling the impact of the Vietnam war, Cuba, Guevara, Southern Africa, Fanon and Debray, for example, amongst sections of young people. There were of course other factors: in particular, the problems posed by the 20th Congress, the whole phenomenon of the Stalin era and the Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia in 1968, served to considerably weaken the influence exercised by the socialist countries and particularly the Soviet Union on youth, especially in comparison with the 1930's.

Pop Music after 1967/8

I now want to consider the development of youth culture after 1967/8. One of my central propositions has been that in the period 1963-7 youth culture achieved a highly unusual degree of homogeneity which embraced, however loosely, large sections of both working class and student youth. Since 1967 this homogeneity has gradually disintegrated and the picture has increasingly become one of diversity and heterogeneity.

Earlier I argued that pop music plays a very special role within the realm of youth culture but, more specifically, that the character of the former between 1963 and 1967 both reflected and to a smaller extent contributed towards the relative cultural homogeneity of youth. Although rock music became increasingly more complex and diverse, it remained essentially unified, inter-connected and compact in a way which helped to encourage and articulate this homogeneity. However, it is evident that by 1967 the music had reached such a stage of development that its ability to perform this unifying role both in the sphere of youth culture and in its own relationship with the different strata of youth was seriously in jeopardy.

Its previous coherence had in a large measure been shaped by and reflected in the position and role of the pop "leaders", above all the Beatles, who acted as a hegemonic force, but also Dylan and the Stones. The dilemma of rock in 1967 became

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

evident in and was expressed by the situation of these musical figures. The Sergeant Pepper LP, for example, marked a certain stage in the Beatles' development which, while in some respects representing their musical apogee, at the same time also marked their own musical turning-point and a musical crossroads for rock music. After Sergeant Pepper, the musical (and indeed philosophical and political) unity of the Beatles began to disintegrate; they lost direction as a group and within their work emerged the quite distinct musical figures and interests of Lennon, McCartney and Harrison.

Similarly the Stones, after the Satanic Majesties LP, went back to their "roots" with songs like Jumping Jack Flash while Dylan did John Wesley Harding and then Nashville Skyline. These figures together with others such as the Cream clearly expressed what had happened to rock: it had become such a disparate musical form that its previous unity had finally been undermined and the only possible way forward lay in the more specialised pursuit of its component parts, namely rock, folk rock, progressive rock and so on.

At the same time however, rock had not only reached a musical crossroads, it had also arrived at a cultural point of no return. The increasing complexity of rock had gradually weakened the bonds which linked it to and made it the expression of youth's aspirations. Rock, as represented by its previous "leaders", now increasingly lost what had previously been one of its hallmarks, namely its ability to communicate with wide sections of youth.

The causes of this "break" lay not only in the increased complexity of the music but also in the socio-economic pressures to which the top pop figures were subject which meant that they became increasingly removed from the experiences of youth, above all those of working class youth and especially of the new younger sections. In short, the mainstream of rock was to a large extent losing its essential characteristic of the period prior to 1967, namely an ability to articulate the feelings of millions of young people.[15]

Youth Culture and Commercial Exploitation

It is necessary at this stage to examine more closely a problem which is of crucial importance to an understanding of both pop music and youth culture, namely the fact that in a society characterised by commodity production there is always pressure to turn every conceivable object which possesses use-value, be it in relation to the stomach or the mind, into a commodity and thereby a source of surplus value.

In this context, some people on the left have seen pop music as a gigantic commercial operation by the big record companies and others designed on the one hand to secure the largest possible profits and on the other hand to keep the minds of the youth off things more political. Unfortunately, life is never quite that simple and only at rare moments like Watergate does the conspiracy theory of capitalism have much explanatory power![16]

However, even if matters are not quite that simple, it is patently obvious, for example, that the domination of much of the music industry by big business is an extremely important factor in determining the character of pop music. More precisely, one can say that the latter is largely moulded by two conflicting but ever-present influences: on the one hand it is shaped by the "needs" of the market and the pressures of the music business while on the other hand, in order to command a mass market, it must enjoy a mass appeal and hence in some measure respond to, express and meet the needs and tastes of millions of young people.[17] Moreover, the balance between these two contradictory influences within pop music is in a constant state of flux, shifting, for example, in favour of the former between 1959 and 1962 and the latter between 1963 and 1967.

Both factors must be recognised. If the "democratic" element within pop is ignored then it is completely impossible to comprehend either the nature of pop or its specific development, in particular the crucial role it has played in the evolution of youth culture during the last decade. Pop music indeed has performed and still performs a very important role in the expression and self-expression of youth and in that sense has an important participatory element. On the other hand, if the commercial exploitation of pop is neglected, it is impossible to see how these "democratic" elements have been distorted and manipulated by the pressures of producing for private profit. In particular, in any study of pop music and youth culture since 1963, it becomes immediately evident how both the established firms within the entertainment world and a newer breed of trendy young capitalists, sometimes sporting velvet trousers, long hair and tinted spectacles, have sought to exploit every conceivable object for profit from drugs and pop festivals to Ché and revolution. Indeed, the recognition of the existence of a massive teenage market, and now, of course, a sub-teenage market, was an

[15] Though in the various threads that emerged out of 1967 etc., the relationship between the "performers" and their particular "audience" was often close and two-way.

[16] The mass media (TV, newspapers etc.,) have of course played an important role in encouraging certain tendencies at particular times but their causal significance in this context should also not be over-estimated.

[17] D. Laing, "Sound of Our Time", 1969, p. 169; also, John Peel, "The Listener", 2 Nov. 1972, p. 581.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

important commercial event of the 60's and found its expression, for example, in the proliferation of boutiques, the growth of commercial radio and the spate of new record companies.[18] It should be noted, however, that the latter was also in part a product of the conflict between the monopoly and conservatism of the big four and the ongoing development of pop music: it was in short an interesting expression of how the democratic character of pop music can itself produce important changes in the structure of the music industry.

Musical Developments

The commercial exploitation of pop music is indeed an important factor in explaining its heterogeneity after 1967. An exceptional cultural quality of pop music between 1963 and 1967 (and indeed later) was the way in which it raised the musical level of millions of young people, acting as a musically educative force in a process of development which engaged youth at a number of different levels, including the encouragement of guitar-playing, etc. However, the music industry is not in business for such ends, as far as it is concerned such an occurrence was and still is simply an accidental by-product. To some extent this is illustrated by the way in which the music industry has responded to the post-1967 situation: as new sections of youth reached their teens and older groups were alienated by the complexity of much of rock (partly illustrated by falling "singles" sales etc.), the industry sought to locate and exploit these new relatively underdeveloped markets with whatever "commodities" were to be found and always irrespective of their musical value and significance.

This in part explains an important tendency in pop in the 70's. New figures like the Osmonds, T. Rex, Slade and Gary Glitter have to some extent filled precisely this gap, namely that posed by the older groups alienated by the music of 1967 etc., the younger generation that did not "live through" 1963-7 and now the sub-teenage generation below it. However, one must be very wary of crude generalisations here for these developments obviously must not and cannot be interpreted solely in terms of the machinations of the record companies etc. Indeed, while Donny Osmond and David Cassidy in many respects resemble the pre-Beatles era in their music and appeal, involving the 8-14 age group of girls in particular, David Bowie attracts a quite different age-range and cultural category while the Slade, whose appeal and development has certain parallels with the 60's group phenomenon, has its own distinct and very wide following: in fact each represent and express very different things and very different youth sub-cultures.

[18] For example, "Ink", 4 Feb. 1972, pp. 9-10, 14.

These are essentially post-60's developments: indeed the physiognomy of the mass pop market over the past year or so, with the revival of singles' sales and the emergence of new "stars", has indicated that these are trends which are new in character and which are primarily concentrated amongst the post-1967 generations.[19] However, alongside and interwoven with (e.g. Rod Stewart, Bowie) these various developments, the more musically-complex tendencies which emerged directly out of the fragmentation of rock after 1967 remain important and influential. One can cite Led Zeppelin, Crosby, Stills and Nash, Vinegar Joe, Fairport Convention, The Band and The Plastic Ono Band as a randomly-chosen illustration, both past and present, of these currents. Their following in the last five years or so has been greatest amongst student and white-collar youth, though it has certainly not been confined to these strata, and its "constituency" of support is probably still dominated by the generation which "lived through" this whole period, though by no means completely.

Before concluding this discussion of musical developments, it is important to refer again to the nature of the fragmentation which has characterised the post-1967 period and in particular to one of its causes and consequences, namely the way in which the music of the 1967/8 period tended to alienate a section of working class youth, as expressed for example, in the skinhead phenomenon.

This was in part both a reaction to the music and a protest against what this section regarded as the "middle-class" character of hippies and the politico-culture of the time. Coming quite often but not always from poorly-paid unskilled jobs, they developed their own distinct and counter identity with the crew-cuts, boots and braces and their "own" music, namely reggae.[20] However, their socio-cultural resentment and antagonism did not generally take progressive forms, indeed their response was sometimes quite reactionary. Thus, both racialist tendencies (usually aimed at Indians and Pakistanis rather than West Indians) and acts of nihilist violence (at football matches etc.) were associated with some sections of skinheads.[21]

Heterogeneity and Working Class Militancy

In the discussion of post-1967/8 developments, I have talked up until now almost exclusively about

[19] The schools students movement (NUSS etc.,) is another example of such new developments.

[20] This of course touches on an important theme I have omitted, namely the West Indian reggae sub-culture; for example, "Sunday Times", 4 Feb. 1973, colour supplement, pp. 12-21.

[21] See Pete Fowler, "Skins Rule" in "Rock File" (ed. C. Gillett), 1972.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the music and how this was subject to a process of fragmentation. However, the nature and causes of this heterogeneity need to be considered on a far more general level and in particular with respect to three specific trends, namely working class militancy, the development of the student movement and the disintegration of the underground which, together, not only contributed towards the further fragmentation of the previous homogeneity, but also in large part shaped what emerged out of it.[22]

The most important single factor has been the changed position of the working class and the intensified nature of the class struggle which has accompanied it. In place of the previous situation, in which the working class (and many of its organisations) gave the appearance to some sections of youth of having been to an extent absorbed in to the system, class conflict has come to occupy the centre of the economic, political and ideological life of the country. This has had a number of important effects on young people, two of which I will mention briefly.

Firstly, significant numbers of young industrial workers have been directly (or indirectly) involved in the various industrial struggles of the last four years and this has inevitably left its mark on their ideological and cultural outlook. It has, for example, not only reinforced the feeling of being socially distinct, of a corporate class consciousness but, partly as a consequence, it has also weakened and even destroyed those elements of a "youth consciousness" which have tended to contradict with and detract from the former amongst industrial youth.

Secondly, it has had an important political and ideological impact on other sections of youth. The historically-evolved core of the working class has, through its struggles, become the focal point of rebellion and protest and, in such a role, has underlined by example the nature and significance of class conflict and the importance of organisation. And it is precisely these developments that have had an important influence on both the student movement and the "underground". Moreover, in demonstrating that the fundamental divisions in society are essentially class rather than generational, working class militancy has helped to undermine the notion that youth is a highly autonomous and even independent social group with common interests which actually over-ride class divisions.

The second factor is the development of the student movement which, since the mid-60's, has changed very considerably, acquiring a history and an experience, some concept of strategy and tactics and a better understanding of the need for organisation. In this process it has been heavily influenced by and established links with the working class movement and all these factors together have helped to give the student movement a more precise and realistic set of political and social bearings. It would be wrong to overestimate these developments, there are still many contradictory tendencies within the student body and both idealism and anarchism remain important influences but their strength has certainly been reduced very significantly since 1968, not least because of the impact of Marxism and the activity of the Communist Party

Disintegration of the "Underground"

The third factor has been the disintegration of the underground as a result of both its own utopianism and the influence of the labour and student movements. The whole concept of an "alternative society", of "dropping out", of "Woodstock" and related ideas are fundamentally illusory: in a capitalist society such alternatives are only realistic for very limited sections and even for them it is generally a very transitory experience. Indeed, the "underground" was in fact rapidly penetrated by commercial exploitation, or more precisely by capitalist relations of production, either through the intervention and operation of the "external" record companies etc., or the "indigenous" velvet-trousered "hippy" bourgeoisie and thus, as a consequence, by a whole set of values which stood in sharp contrast to those for which the underground, however confusedly, had stood. At the same time, the underground found itself in conflict with the law: this involved not only the question of drugs but also the sexual frankness which was an important characteristic of this movement but which aroused the antagonism of on the one hand the "Mary Whitehouse" brigade and the social strata to whom she appealed and on the other hand sections of the judiciary who maintained a reactionary and, from the point of view of even the interests of the ruling class, an at times blinkered attitude towards such trends. The *OZ* trial was the most famous consequence. Thus, between 1968 and 1971, the underground largely collapsed around its own ears and its own internal and external contradictions.

Some sections, notably those who were obsessed with the behavioural and stylistic sides and who were therefore unable to perceive the real contradictions of capitalist society, were effectively integrated, along with their ideas, into a passive acceptance of the system: this included, for example, those who, having taken the drugs solution seriously, became hardened, cynical and sometimes consciously anti-political and anti-left.

[22] There are of course other factors. For example, there was a marked deterioration in youth unemployment in 1966-7 (especially the July figures), notably for the 20-24 age-groups but also for the 18-19 and to a lesser extent 15-17 age-groups; "British Labour Statistics Yearbook" 1970, p. 322, table 147. this may well have had an influence on certain sections and in particular areas.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But this was and is by no means the whole picture. Despite the predominantly idealist and utopian framework within which the underground developed, many of its ideas and beliefs were essentially progressive and anti-capitalist. Most were not lost with the disintegration of the underground: rather, the lessons of its demise together with the example of the working class movement in particular helped to provide the conditions for a development and refinement of the various "cultural alternatives" (theatre, film, music etc.) which had evolved in the underground.

As examples of this trend we can cite the growth of such artistic movements as street and community theatre, in which the performers have sought to identify with the working class in both the form and the content of their work,[23] and the series of Rainbow pop concerts in London whose proceeds went to the UCS Fighting Fund. At the same time various other issues like sexuality and the "quality of life", in which the underground has taken a keen interest, have been taken up more widely.[24] Indeed, to speak more generally, one of the consequences of the student movement and the underground (or rather, more correctly, what sections of it have become) has been a more widespread "sensitisation" to a whole series of new issues (sexism, the environment, nature of education etc.), all of which are in one way or another products and expressions of class society: these movements have therefore not only helped to reveal new dimensions to the crisis of capitalism but have also helped to bring an awareness of the importance and significance of these issues to sections of the labour movement and the middle strata.

Conclusions

In the mid-1960's the revolt of youth was characteristically expressed in a very general and often, but not always, generational manner, notably through the medium of pop music and related areas. Indeed, although youth was oppressed in a whole number of different ways, at this juncture it proved most sensitive to that exercised within the artistic-cultural domain, though this in itself was of course also a reflection and an expression of its wider situation.

The seventies already presents a somewhat different picture from that of the sixties. Recalling the points I made earlier in relation to the concrete forms of youth's oppression, it would seem that this "youth rebellion" has increasingly been channelled into action on more specific issues arising from these different modes of oppression. Thus we have for example, the emergence and development of the student movement, the school students' movement, the women's movement, the increasing participation of young workers in industrial struggles and the various artistic alternatives. The causes of this shift are multifarious; the growing crisis of these spheres (the economy, education etc.), the influence of the working-class movement, the lessons learnt through the ongoing development of the various components of the youth movement etc. It should not of course be exaggerated, only a minority of youth are actively involved and alongside these trends exist others of either a more passive or, in some cases, of a reactionary and anti-social character, but nevertheless its significance should not be underestimated. We might note also that one of the effects of this shift has been, not only to accentuate this heterogeneity of youth culture but also to reduce its more pointedly generational overtones.

Thus, although the picture is one of considerable complexity, the last decade has witnessed important advance amongst youth.

However, that advance remains highly variegated with many different trends: the question that faces us now is how to translate the progressive developments into a more organised and consolidated form, above all in the shape of a more influential and larger Communist Party and YCL. This problem is certainly not new: it faced us in the 60's. But now, with the general political advances in the working class, student, youth and women's movements together with the more generally recognised role of the Communist Party in these developments, the conditions for advance amongst youth are more favourable. However, our ability to realise these possibilities will depend perhaps above all on our ideological and cultural work, on our ability to comprehend the various trends amongst youth and to come to grips with them. Not least this involves combating the various forms of spontaneity, be they economist or anarchist, with the theory and practice of Marxism. (*Discussion contributions on this article should not exceed 2,000 words in length.*)

[23] As, for example, illustrated by the meetings of "Intermedia": Morning Star, 25 Oct. 1971.

[24] This is not to underestimate the continuing influence of idealism (e.g. Divine Light Mission) and anarchist ideas but their influence has waned and that of Marxism increased somewhat since 1967/8, at least amongst these sections.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Note on the International Socialists and the Student Movement

Dave Cook and Digby Jacks

(This note appeared as a supplement to the Bulletin of the Student Committee of the Communist Party. We thought it would be of interest to our readers.)

The following notes are based on the assertion that the strategic "line" that emerges from the overall IS theoretical position is as follows:—

> The main conflict internationally is between "state capitalist" bureaucracies and revolutionary forces.
>
> The Communist Parties are to a greater or lesser extent agents of one of these "state capitalist" groupings.
>
> The political battle in Britain is first and foremost against bureaucrats, whether the right reformists (Labour) or left reformists (CP) who dominate inert and undemocratic organisations.
>
> The key requirement, therefore, is to form "rank and file" groupings opposed to the "bureaucracy" out of which the "revolutionary party" will be formed.

To a large extent IS practice in the student movement stems from the application of these principles.

IS Policy towards the Student Movement

The first point to note is there has been an enormous change in IS theory and policy since October 1968 when they issued "Education, Capitalism, and Student Revolt" written among others by Chris Harman.

Then, although never as crudely "Student Vanguardist" as the New Left Review Group and the IMG, there were strong "Vanguardist" elements in their theory. Here is an excerpt from the introduction to the pamphlet:

> "Revolution today is no longer the empty word that it has been for some decades in the West. No more do Western socialists need to look with envy on the struggling peasants of the Third World. It is the contradictions of advanced industrial capitalism which are now beginning to explode. Dramatic, world wide convulsions have blasted away the limitations on human possibilities which capitalist prosperity had seemed to make final. They have reminded us that we still have great opportunities—larger than before—of realising the dreams of generations for a new world to replace the barbarity of capitalism.
>
> "*Students have contributed more than any other social group to this change in the political climate.* Campuses have exploded across the world—Tokyo, Berkeley, Nanterre, Berlin, Milan, Warsaw, London, and hundreds more. The strikers, sitters-in and demonstrators have rarely contented themselves with narrow reforms of their immediate situation. Consciously and creatively, the movement has challenged the whole structure and ideology of the university and bourgeois society. Everyone, the ruling class included, must recognise the reality of the 'student revolution'." (*Our emphasis*).

The student programme they outlined then was designed to challenge the various aspects of *control* exercised by the authorities over students. Thus the issues of "in loco parentis" and most importantly, against exams, were projected as the student battleground. The pamphlet stated: "The question of exams is central to all the control mechanisms in Higher Education", and went on to say that "such demands do not merely challenge the present forms of control over the university . . . it is a critical process whereby there is ever-widening consciousness of society and the world". The student struggle was conceived, explained and sloganised as within the campus boundaries. Only right at the end of the five page section of the programme comes the sentence "Of course it is necessary for students to give this challenge a really biting edge by participating in the work of the revolutionary movement in the working class". The pamphlet ended with a rather cautious hope that the Revolutionary Socialist Students Federation

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(RSSF) might turn into some sort of co-ordinating federation of "militants".

Now IS have totally discarded these theories. Their 1972 student pamphlet "Students and the Struggle for Socialism" written among others by Colin Sparks, starts from the international crisis, goes on to the growth of militant struggle among the working class, and then attempts to place the students in some sort of class context. "It is the basic premise of the pamphlet that only an understanding of the working class movement and the relations of capitalism as a whole can show the way forward for students". IS have implicitly admitted that their previous "Vanguardist" position was hopelessly wrong. IS condemn "the extreme theoretical primitiveness of the RSSF" and recognise that the Liaison Committee for the Defence of Student Unions (LCDSU)" was quite incapable of providing direction and leadership to the mass of the students".

IS ignore the problem of explaining why therefore they spent three years in these organisations, but there is no doubt that their line has changed completely. Now Martin Shaw, a co-author of the 1968 pamphlet, in his review of it in "Socialist Worker" was critical of this dismissal of their "Vanguardist" past, "the militancy of 1967-70 is too easily dismissed", he wrote.

What now takes its Place

The Communist Party argues that the main responsibility facing socialists in the student movement is to seek to involve the *mass* of students in action and struggle through their unions—both on the issues that directly confront them (grants, democracy, White Paper, etc.) and in solidarity with the struggles of the working class and those fighting for national liberation and socialism. We argue that this perspective of involving students en masse makes sense because:

> Of social changes in the origins of students and in the careers to which they proceed on completion of studies. Students increasingly come from backgrounds and go on to jobs more closely related to those involved directly in production.
>
> The fact that the Government attacks students en masse as part of its attempts to transfer the cost of the current crisis on to the working class as a whole.
>
> The crisis in Higher Education represented by the Tory Government's attempt to reorganise it "on the cheap" and to link it more closely to the needs of state monopoly capitalism affects the whole of post school education and students within it.

We argue that these changes among and pressures on students make realistic our perspective of their mass involvement.

IS say that students must be mobilised on the basis of what they call "socialist revolutionary politics". In their open letter to the LCDSU (Sept. '72) they wrote: "IS regard the prime task in the student milieu as being the struggle to win students to revolutionary socialist politics". In "LSE—Marxist Perspective", IS student leader, Colin Sparks wrote, "It has become increasingly clear that in the present period only revolutionary politics can provide a perspective for a major (grants) campaign."

Now IS know that it is only going to be possible to mobilise a minority of students on such a basis and in their more honest (or careless) moments they let slip what would happen if they won what they call a "Marxist" NUS. Mike Hill, IS Presidential candidate, said in the *Observer* before Exeter, that his victory could mean a split of National Union of Students (NUS) into separate student federations.

Now in certain situations it may be possible to mobilise large sections of a student body on extremely advanced demands, and indeed to sustain such mobilisation. Where this is possible, it is obviously important that this is done, but this in itself will depend on the overall position and particularly the level of activity of the working class movement.

IS, of course, know this. What, then, do IS want?

In line with their overall analysis of the battle in mass organisations as being between the "bureaucracy" and the "rank and file", IS advances policies ostensibly for the NUS—for the student movement as a whole—but which in fact are designed to be a focus to unite "militants" against the NUS leadership and the mass movement of students. IS know full well that there is little chance of winning the majority of students for grants campaign demands which include examination boycotts and unlimited occupations etc., at the present time. Their main reasons for advancing such demands relates to their requirements as a relatively small organisation trying to create conditions out of which "the revolutionary party" can be formed. These conditions they see as the establishment of "rank and file" groupings posed against the "bureaucracies". Loud was their annoyance when they failed to transform the Liaison Committee for the Defence of Trade Unions into an organisation that would be a centre *against* the Trade Union leadership instead of a centre to strengthen the leftward political trend in the TUs involving both rank and file and leaderships who represented

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this trend. This latter is, of course, the Communist Party's position.

Hence IS have passed through a succession of vehicles for "rank and filism"—"RSSF", "LCDSU"—and are currently engaged in the "Alternative Left".

Students and the Working Class

They justified this approach theoretically by attacking our policy which they characterise as "student trade unionism". They claim that the Communist Party wants to "recruit students into the anti-monopoly alliance without a political struggle", to be done by "reclassifying students as honorary members of the working class". (Colin Sparks in "LSE—Marxist Perspective"). They claim "there is nothing in the inner logic of the struggle itself to make this (by which they mean the move towards the working class) either necessary or continuous". In other words, they deny our central assertion that there are deep social pressures on students which make it possible to mobilise them en masse. They argue that this is impossible because students are not "a socially homogeneous grouping".

Let us be completely clear. Students are not workers, nor are they a socially homogeneous grouping. The NUS is not a trade union. Students have no bargaining power in any way similar to that exercised by organised workers at the point of production. Nowhere do we say these things.

What we do say is that certain social changes among students, and pressures to which they are subject as a group in society enable the development of mass, democratic campaigning students unions and the closer alignment of the mass of students in solidarity with the working class.

Obviously these pressures, and others of a more directly "political" nature such as dissillusionment with the betrayals of right wing labour and the impact of national liberation struggles, Vietnam, South Africa etc., drive a growing number of students to socialist conclusions. Our aim is to find appropriate forms for this unity of socialist students and to find a way of relating it to the mass movement. What we recognise very clearly, is that to attempt to impose demands appropriate for this socialist minority as campaigning demands for the organisations representing *all* students, will, if successful, lead to splits and disillusionment, and can open the way for the domination of the mass movement by the right wing. To this the IS are indifferent. We are not.

Finally, as revolutionaries, we recognise that the mobilisation of the mass of students in action through democratic student unions is by itself *not sufficient* to lead people to the adoption of revolutionary conclusions. This requires the conscious work of the Communist Party to raise the level of understanding of those involved in struggle to see the need for socialist revolution, and to develop the organisation, theory, confidence, and unity of the mass of the students. Thus the greater our involvement in the mass organisation of students, the *greater* must be our assertion of the policy of the Party and the theory of Marxism-Leninism.

How do we respond to IS?

Make no mistake about it, IS are intent on challenging the position of the Party in the student movement. There have been calls in their theoretical journal for the need for IS to set up student branches. A recent article distributed in London School of Economics by Martin Shaw finished with the sentence, "The fight between the Communist Party and the IS will become increasingly more important in the NUS". Several points are worth making here:

> That the potential extent of the broad left, i.e. all who share our perspective of uniting the mass of students in action—is the overwhelming majority of the student left. We are working to make the perimeters of the broad left reach its full potential. Influence among this majority section of the "left" is the *main* objective of our political work among socialist students.
>
> To theoretically "annihilate" IS requires much more offensive *theoretical* and *political* response to their views.
>
> Around the committed state capitalist/Trotskyist core of IS are some who can be moved towards the Party. Among those influenced by IS e.g. the readership of the Socialist Worker, there must be many more. The extent to which we detach these sections from their inner core will depend on how far, how effectively, and by what means we polemise against their incorrect theories.

Therefore, we suggest that our approach towards the IS in the student movement is as follows:—

1. On *specific issues* we are for the unity of all who can be united in action and struggle. This will often include IS, but always our approach is to involve the widest possible numbers and organisations. Therefore we will often argue against the IS line where they seek to narrow down the potential involvement by insisting on demands which only "revolutionaries" can support.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

2. In *NUS* we seek to unite all who share our conception that the mass of students can be involved in struggle through their unions. IS contest this perspective—theoretically and continually in their practice. Therefore they exclude themselves from the perimeters of the broad left unity we seek to forge.
3. In *College Socialist Societies* we seek to involve *all* socialist students. We are for broad socialist societies which fulfil several functions—i.e. to act as a forum for the left viewpoints in the college, to be a platform for speakers from the Labour movement, to be a focus of left wing activitism in the college. We would also add that they should buttress leftward developments in the unions at a local level. Where IS contest this perspective for Socialist Societies we must fight their views politically, although seeking to avoid an endless IS/CP polemic.

Discussion Contributions on:

Marxism and the Family

Peter Pink

The monogamous male-dominated family of today is the product of the ruling classes in class society. It is perfectly fashioned to serve a particular purpose—to make sure that a male heir is available to inherit the accumulated wealth of the father. It is from this source that the ideas of male supremacy, female subjugation and dependence, and the necessity of children to be obedient to their father flow. It is the mainspring that keeps the ideas alive.

Each ruling class has adopted this attitude to the family. Prior to their class becoming the ruling class, in the days of the development of capitalist islands within the structure of feudalism, the wives and children of the capitalists had been part of the family workforce. Once the capitalists became the ruling class and had the wealth necessary to finance the change, they adopted the classic ruling class family as their own. Their wives and children were banished to mansions, away from participation in the business of production and trade now carried on by the father outside the home.

In class society the ideas of the ruling class are the ruling ideas, and this applies to the family as in all other fields. The ruling class sees its ideas as the only possible ones that can be entertained, since they see society in terms of their class interests only. They are blinkered by their class outlook. Every other class has these ideas foisted on them, whether they suit their objective circumstances or not.

Class Contradictions

But class society has its contradictions. In feudal society his church said that the man was superior and his wife and children should obey him. This was supposed to be true for all, but for the serf this could be rendered meaningless by the lord exerting his rights over the serf. The learned monk Regino of Prum in the tenth century noted that the local law laid down that "If a bondman and bondwoman be separated by cause of sale, they must be bidden to remain thus if we are not able to join them together". He is upset that this "Christian" law runs counter to the law of God that wives should cleave to husbands, and quotes the Theodosian Codex to the effect that when slaves are divided among heirs and beneficiaries, families must be kept together and some other equivalent found for the inequality thus introduced in the portions. It is interesting to note that, despite the learned monk and others, monks and bishops when wearing their feudal-lord hat as opposed to their mitre, so to speak, took part in these sort of transactions.

The same sort of contradiction raised its head early on in the case of capitalism. The British capitalist class made tremendous strides in the accumulation of wealth through the factory system and the establishment of capitalist relations in agriculture. This wealth enabled it to ape those it had just dispossessed as the ruling class, the landed aristocracy, a fact noted with much humour by Engels in the introduction to *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*. They wished that all classes should adopt their views.

But for the new working class this development meant the undermining of the family in practice. The initial impact of the factory system was so severe, as was the gang system in agriculture, that Marx and Engels could not see the family surviving in the working class. Prior to this period, each family had worked as a unit. Now each member of the family (man, woman and child) was taken to the point of production as an individual. When demand for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

labour was high, the capitalist took all members of the family, and the wages paid were such that all needed to work to survive. When demand for labour was at a lower level, the family depended on the labour of the wife alone, or the wife and children, or the children alone. Some children were snatched from the workhouses and treated as though they were not part of a family at all. 200,000 men were employed at the height of the railway building boom, navvies wandering the face of Britain with no opportunity of family life at all.

Here, indeed, were all the relations of the family as presented to all as the eternal truth stood on their head. Who was "head" of the family now? Obviously he/she who paid the piper called the tune, and examples of women in relatively well paid employment dispensing with husbands (but not children) are recorded, as are instances of children refusing to support their parents. And, of course, of parents selling the labour of their children.

The Working Class Family

In *Origin of the Family* Engels says of the working class family, ". . . all the foundations of typical monogamy are cleared away. Here there is no property to preserve and bequeath for which monogamy and male supremacy were established; hence there is no incentive to make this male supremacy effective." However, we know to our cost that the ideas of the capitalists can so effectively be made the ideas of the proletarians! If women and children are regarded in the British working class family by the male members of that family in much the same way as the capitalists regard the members of their families, it must be that the ruling class have convinced a large number of members of the working class of the correctness of this view. Not just the men, either; women have also been convinced, or they would not accept their position so easily as they seem to.

In order to achieve this state of affairs the capitalists were aided in two main ways. One of these was that this view of the family is as old as class society itself, and that means for most people who have no conception of the class basis of ideas, that this view had existed for ever and had moral force. The other way that the capitalists were aided was the ability of the better paid workers to squeeze out of the capitalists some of the super profits of imperialism. The worker in this position was able to support "his" family in the manner he was told was correct, and to imitate his capitalist master. For him, it was possible to confine the woman to the home, to adopt the dictatorial role in the family. It is easy to overstate this factor, for it was by no means universal, but it happened enough to make these ideas the ideal to aim at.

Maximum Profit

It would be wrong to adopt the view that this meant that capitalism no longer disrupts the family in the working class. The 1930s in Britain was a time when capitalism denied the conditions for the continuation of "normal" family relations in the working class. Mass unemployment led to children leaving home. They left home for work elsewhere, or because by remaining at home their earnings cut the relief payments to their parents. Men were split away from their families and sent to work camps. Today, this is still the problem for many in those areas where persistent unemployment is still a major social evil. If we go outside Britain, we still see much more severe forms of family disruption—contract labour in South Africa, where the worker is taken into employment on the express condition that he does not take his family with him; foreign workers (Greeks, Turks, Yugoslavs, Spaniards etc.) living outside the family situation with no hope of establishing it, in the Common Market—the examples are too numerous to list. The situation is one where the desire of the ruling class that all should conform is contradicted by the actual conditions in which workers exist as a result of the system.

It is often asserted that there is a "modern" family, not differing by class. This family is said to be supported by capitalism so that it will provide a market for consumer goods. It is believed that the continuation of capitalism is helped by the continued existence of this family (indeed, some say its very existence depends upon it). But it can be seen that capitalism can exist with or without the continued existence of the family in the working class. It is wrong to assume that because the salesmen aim their sales talk at the family that this means that they would not change their approach to a different situation. They already do this in relation to the "Youth Market", where no reference is made to the family as this would cut across the sales pitch being made. Capitalism tries to sell whatever the situation. The continued existence of the family in the working class under capitalism is by no means certain, and is certainly not necessary. The driving force underlying capitalism is maximum profit, and if maximum profit leads to the undermining of the family, it will be undermined whatever the desire of the capitalists.

What is the position of the working class family in Britain today? Its real position, as opposed to what may be thought to be the position by many workers, is precisely as Engels described it. There are no objective grounds on which male domination can be justified. In inflation ridden, crisis-racked modern capitalist Britain, all members of this family are interdependent, and that means that the basis of the acceptance of capitalist values is undermined.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Who Loses?

The main losers in the family from the acceptance of capitalist ideas are women. Instead of finding within the family support for their efforts to increase their status and widen their opportunities, they too often are conditioned to accept their role. Girls are taught, by example and word, by the other members of the family that they are "specially fitted" to perform certain functions, to have certain responsibilities that must condition their expectations in other directions. Woman the homemaker, woman the "bringer-up" of children, woman the servant of all the family, is still the major conception. These functions (they are told) are primary, the others secondary. It is mainly in the family that the "double exploitation" of women takes place. In her place in the outside world, in education and in work, when she comes up against this same attitude and wishes to oppose it, she usually receives no help from the family, no encouragement to challenge obstacles.

But men lose too. They are conditioned to be strong, masterful, domineering, and that they should have nothing to do with "women's" work. This attitude colours their decisions in relation to work amongst children, and often severely effects their relationship with their own children. They have been taught to play a role, conditioned as women are, but in different directions.

The Real Fight

Surely our correct aim is to fight to make the family disentangle from capitalism and shed its reactionary aspects. The family can then become a weapon against capitalism. Many a working class family, where there is a common acceptance of a working class outlook and a deep solidarity, has already become a partial bulwark of struggle against reaction. Of course, capitalism tries continuously to absorb the family into its own establishment and make it serve capitalism. But surely we are not going to accept that capitalism should be allowed freely to fulfil its aims.

The argument that the family is a fixed part of the capitalist superstructure and unchangeable is like the argument that Trade Unions are part of the apparatus of capitalism. We resist the economic and ideological attempts of capitalism to "tame" the unions in this manner, and fight for them to become strongholds of anti-capitalist activities. Likewise, we must struggle so that our families become bases from which to fight capitalism. It is defeatist to suggest that this cannot be done.

It certainly needs a great effort to change the ideas of members of the family (just as a great effort is needed to change the ideas of trade unionists), or else the family will continue to be a repository of reactionary ideas. The task is to identify the reactionary ideas and expose them for what they are —capitalist ideas.

There is a danger of an over-simplified polarisation between those who say "defend the family" and give the impression, whether they mean to or not, that we should defend the family *as it is now*, deeply scarred by capitalist ideas, and, on the other hand, those who say "abolish it", ignoring the fact that the family has a long history of mutation to fit different circumstances. Dogmatic assertions on both sides leads to a sterile discussion divorced from reality.

The Althusser Debate

John Wrigley

Whilst I cannot at this stage contribute a complete "article" to *Marxism Today*, I would like to take up one point with Maurice Cornforth with regard to his otherwise excellent article on the Althusser/Lewis debate. This concerns his section on "Alienation" where he is discussing the 1844 Manuscripts. He writes that Marx conceived of private property being a consequence of the alienation of labour, and goes on from this to accuse Marx of recoursing to "philosophical categories" as ultimate factors in explanation, and then to assert that the *Manuscripts*' treatment of alienation is inconsistent.

Neither of these in true. Marx writes:—

> "Private property is thus the product, the result, the necessary consequence, of alienated labour, of the external relation of the worker to nature and to himself". (*Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of* 1844, p. 72).

But Marx is extraordinarily emphatic about this relationship of alienated labour to property. He goes on to compare this relationship to the origin of the gods:—

> "But on analysis of this concept it becomes clear that though private property appears to be the source, the cause of alienated labour, it is really its consequence, just as the gods in the beginning are not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the cause but the effect of man's intellectual confusion. Later this relationship becomes reciprocal." (*ibid* p. 72).

On the face of it, it would appear that, as Maurice Cornforth writes, Marx is inconsistent. But it is important to understand the concept of alienation to understand the development of Marx's thought in his more scientific works. And in fact this primacy of alienated labour is logical.

Naturally Marx was not referring in this passage to the historical development of the accumulation of capital. He was giving a structural analysis of the relationship of man to nature. We find a clue in his meaning several pages later:—

> "When one speaks of private property, one thinks of being concerned with something external to man. When one speaks of labour, one is directly concerned with man himself." (*ibid* p. 82).

In other words Marx is seeking the human reality underlying the broader categories of political economy, and finds this reality of man's relationship to nature expressed in the activity of alienated labour. To derive forms of human activity from categories external to it, whether from God or private property, is a way of thought characteristic of alienated consciousness. All of Marx's thought is predicated on this essentially humanist standpoint, and to say that Marx later reversed this relationship of labour to property is incorrect. To attribute power to private property and make man its object is to do what Cornforth accuses Althusser of, to neglect the dialectical nature of Marx's thought. If private property appears to dominate man, then it is as a result of alienated activity creating an alienated product, a reified "private property". The *German Ideology* accepts this framework, seeing labour and activity as more fundamental than private property, and showing that forms of ownership are determined by the development of labour:—

> "The mode of production . . . is a definite form of activity of these individuals, a definite form of expressing their life, a definite mode of life on their part." (p. 42).

It also accepts that alienation is crucial to an understanding of the historical development of the division of labour. (See for example pages 55-56).

It is not then Marx who is confused, but Cornforth's interpretation of him. Of course, alienation is not a very useful analytical fool, it is too broad a concept and Marx probably realised this when he wrote it was "a term to please the philosopher". But it is neverthless a crucial concept to an understanding of the development of Marx's thought, and must be recognised as such.

A. Ray

I would like to raise a few points on Maurice Cornforth's comments on Louis Althusser's reply to John Lewis (May 1973 issue).

Science and Philosophy

There is a fundamental difference between Science and Philosophy. Philosophy is a world outlook of a class. Its degree of objectivity is determined by the relative position of that particular class in the socio-economic structure. To take a historical example, the capitalist class by its opposition to feudalism, expounded a body of philosophy which exploded the lies and myths of feudal ideology and to that extent sought truth. However, the same class, by its very opposition to the working class, foresook truth and established its own myths to perpetuate its oppression of the proletariat. In philosophy, therefore, one sets out to serve a class and thereby arrive at a degree of objectivity, the degree being determined by the nature of the class.

Science on the other hand continues to explore reality despite attempts by the exploiting classes to use it to serve them. It represents, on the whole, a positive dynamic force within the framework of a class relationship which is static; hence the latter eventually becomes a fetter to the former (in a society based on exploitation).

Things in their relationship

"The whole object of dialectical materialism is to know things in their relationship". But one can define relationship in such a way as to show that diverse elements always tend to move towards an equilibrium (e.g. General equilibrium model of Walras). A marxist must therefore add to the above statement that knowledge of things in their relationship becomes meaningful only when it enables one to understand 'change' and that 'changes' are brought about by conflict of opposing forces.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Marxism and Dialectical Method

John Hoffman

Richard Gunn's piece on *Marxism and the Dialectical Method* (July, 1973) was both lucid and lively and there is certainly something to be said for the thesis that Marxism can be seen as the "cutting edge of Enlightenment attitudes", for Marxism in its rationality and open-mindedness owes much to the humanism and rationalism of that period.

But despite its attractive presentation, Comrade Gunn's piece misses what is, in my view, the crucial and decisive point about Marxist dialectics and that is this. Dialectics is not simply, as his article suggests, a *method* or a way of looking at the world. Dialectics *is* the historical movement of the real world itself, and it exists in our heads *only* because it already exists in the world outside. What we call a dialectical *approach* is only dialectical in so far as it approximates to the dialectical nature of the real world itself.

Marx, not surprisingly, is both emphatic and unequivocal on this point: in the famous Preface to *Capital* where he contrasts his own position to that of Hegel's, he writes,

> "with me, on the contrary, the ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind and translated into forms of thought".

Theoretical dialectics, that is to say, can only exist as a *reflection* of the practical dialectics of the material world and this material world includes of course both society and the world of nature itself. Even some Yugoslav critics have conceded (rather gloomily) that Marx himself was impressed by the need for "a dialectic in nature" and the idea, central to the heart of Marxist philosophy, cannot simply be dismissed by a quotation from John Lewis' recent book!

The Read World

It is true that Comrade Gunn does seek to assure us that he regards thinking as a social project and that thoughts are intrinsically social in origin, but these statements by no means suffice to rescue dialectics from methodological subjectivism and do not, in themselves, move one inch beyond the positions held by pragmatism, phenomenology and the other idealisms which find some favour today. The real question (indeed, the *rational* question), Comrade Gunn, is not whether dialectics is socially derived, non-reified, undogmatic etc., the real question is whether dialectics is *true* or not, and to answer *this* question (surely the most fundamental of all) we must have some idea about the dialectical character of reality itself. Otherwise we confine ourselves to the world of thought and everything we care to say about dialectics remains trivial, formal and quite *unprovable,* the prisoner of that subjectivist circularity which afflicts all who decline to acknowledge the independent objectivity of the real world itself.

For what makes Marxist dialectics *truly* rational is that, unlike the idealist "dialectics" of the past, *it can account for its own origins,* it can sustain that *historical* dimension which breaks down both in Hegel and in the Abstract Reason of the Enlightenment. Hence an authentic dialectics cannot *begin* in the world of consciousness for that necessarily shrouds its origins in mystery, but can only find its source, whether initially millions of years ago or as a daily "rebirth" in everyday existence, in "unthinking" matter—in that world which is dialectical whether we like it or not, in that *real* world which exists *independently* of consciousness and the human will. It is this *objective* dimension of real dialectics which so scandalises the Jean-Paul Sartres and Alfred Schmidts of this world, for it enables Marxism to provide a rational answer to those questions of truth and reality which academic philosophers (for whom a *retreat* from the concrete world is the order of the day) arrogantly dismiss as "metaphysical"—not untrue or false—but "metaphysical"! A theory which asserts the independent objectivity of the real world must be "dogmatic" and "metaphysical" for it leaves no room whatsoever for that idealism which is the *raison d'être* of so many a university professor! To rid dialectics of the mysticism of the past, that, as Marx predicted, would be "a scandal and an abomination to bourgeoisdom and its doctrinaire professors".

Richard Gunn is still coming to terms with this past, and once he frees himself from some of the idealist debris which floats around our universities, he will soon see the absurdity of a purely theoretical or "methodological" dialectic which can only dissolve itself in its own subjectivism, and thus be able to make the leap to that self-consistent rationalism which he so rightly admires.

Published by the Communist Party, 16 King Street, London, WC2E 8HY. and printed by Farleigh Press Ltd. (T.U.), Watford, Herts — 25194

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Journals in the English Language from the U.S.S.R.

SOCIAL SCIENCES

Discusses theoretical problems of world and Soviet history, philosophy, economics, international working class movement, law, sociology and literature.

Quarterly **50p** 1 year subscription **£2.10**
2 years subscription **£3.50**

CULTURE AND LIFE

This illustrated monthly deals with the participation of Soviet people in public life and national economy. The magazine also features Soviet scientific and cultural news.

On subscription only 1 year **£1.00**
2 years **£1.75**

SOVIET LITERATURE

New Soviet writing and criticism

Monthly **8p** 1 year subscription **75p**
2 years subscription **£1.20**

SPUTNIK

Monthly digest of Soviet press and literature. Includes memoirs, detective stories, political essays, fiction, art reproductions, fashions, cookery, humour etc.

Monthly **18p** 1 year subscription **£2.10**
2 years subscription **£3.50**

SOVIET FILM

Illustrated monthly. Articles about Soviet and foreign films, actors, producers and other cinema workers.

Monthly **8p** 1 year subscription **75p**
2 years subscription **£1.20**

Catalogues of Soviet journals in Russian and other languages available on request. Subscriptions may be placed through

CENTRAL BOOKS LIMITED
37 Grays Inn Road, London, WC1X 8PS

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW: 1973

No. 7

FOREIGN WORKERS IN WESTERN EUROPE

ECONOMIC INTEGRATION. VIEWS AND JUDGEMENTS OF RESEARCH INSTITUTES

THE WAY OF RAPID SOCIALIST DEVELOPMENT
By E. Gierek

Price 13p plus postage
£1.50 for one year
from

CENTRAL BOOKS LIMITED
37 Grays Inn Road, London WC1X 8PS

MARX MEMORIAL LIBRARY

Lectures (Fridays: 7.30 p.m.)

September 14th.
CHILE—What Goes on There?
D. Lehmann

September 28th.
THE 50th ANNIVERSARY OF THE SEPTEMBER RISING AGAINST FASCISM IN BULGARIA
Andrew Rothstein

Classes

in Marxism, Economics, Philosophy, Art, the Family, all start in September. Send for folder and register *now*.

International Discussion Seminar
Saturday and Sunday, November 24th/25th, 1973 at NUFTO Hall

Subject:
THE CONTRIBUTION OF MARXIST THOUGHT TO THE PROGRESS OF MANKIND

Opening speakers include James Klugmann (Britain) and Marxist scholars from the USSR, France and GDR.

Book the date in your diary NOW
All lectures and classes at,
37a Clerkenwell Green, London EC1

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sept 6th

Raymond Southall

Literature and the rise of Capitalism

Studies in English literature from the Love Poetry of the sixteenth century to the prosaic commonsense of Dr Johnson.

Raymond Southall (whose first book *The Courtly Maker: The Poetry of Wyatt and his Contemporaries* has already won wide acclaim) is lecturer in English at the University of Sheffield.

£2.50

Available

POLITICAL WRITINGS of William Morris

For William Morris, poet and prose writer, artist and craftsman, politics was never a narrow thing but embraced every side of human life. Especially he concerned himself with the relation of the arts to society and his writings on this topic are fully represented here. Edited with an Introduction by A. L. MORTON.

paperback £1

LAWRENCE & WISHART
46 BEDFORD ROW
LONDON WC1R 4LR

Collet's LONDON BOOKSHOP
64-66 Charing Cross Road,
London WC2H 0BD

ARTICLES FROM THE NEUE RHEINISCHE ZEITUNG 1848-49
by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels
£1.00 plus 16p p.&p.

THE SOVIET COURT
by T. Terebilov
An examination of the Soviet Judiciary today, including a brief historical survey from 1919 to the present day. 90p plus 16p p.&p.

SOVIET MAN
by G. Smirnov
An examination of the historical causes and social conditions that have made Soviet man what he is, a socialist type of personality.
90p plus 16p p.&p.

REVOLUTIONARIES
by E. J. Hobsbawm
A collection of essays and lectures written over the last decade, by one of Britain's leading Marxists. £3.95 plus 16p p.&p.

POLITICAL POWER AND SOCIAL CLASSES
by N. Poulantzas
An important work constituting one of the first Marxist studies of the central theoretical problems posed by the nature of the capitalist State. £5.75 plus 21p p.&p.

MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITY AND AFRICAN EMPLOYMENT IN SOUTH AFRICA
This well documented, if controversial, book is the product of a panel investigation by seven black and white African academics and leaders.
£1.50 plus 16p p.&p.

SOCIALISM, DEMOCRACY AND NATIONALISM IN INDIA
by Sankar Ghose £3.75 plus 21p p.&p.

NO NEUTRAL GROUND
by Joel Carlson
The story of a courageous political lawyer in Johannesburg who eventually escaped to London. £4.00 plus 25p p.&p.

THEORIES OF VALUE AND DISTRIBUTION SINCE ADAM SMITH
by Maurice Dobb
Ideology and economic theory.
£3.60 plus 16p p.&p.

THIS MONTH'S BOOK BARGAIN!
THE MANCHESTER MARTYRS
by Paul Rose
A Fenian tragedy. Selling price £1.25, offered for 50p post free

FOR OUR SECOND HAND DEPARTMENT
Highest prices paid for the Marxist classics, books on working class history and women's liberation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED